

for the passage of the McCarran-Lea bill regulating transportation by air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2981. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Queens-Nassau Home Builders League, Inc., recommending and advocating legislation which will empower the Federal Housing Administration to negotiate mortgages for a period of 30 years at 4-percent interest on a basis of 90 percent of the value of the property, thereby permitting contracts of purchase to be executed with cash down payments of 10 percent of the purchase price, annual amortization payments to be made over 30 instead of 20 years, and all monthly charges to be within the capacity of the budget of the average family; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2982. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, New York City, concerning increase in personnel of the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2983. Also, petition of the Lily-Tulip Cup Corporation, New York City, concerning the McCarran bill (S. 2) and the Lea bill (H. R. 7273); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2984. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Williamsport and Jersey Shore, Pa., protesting against the erection of a monument to the memory of Robert Ingersoll in the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 1937

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, our Father in Heaven, incline our hearts to do Thy will. We thank Thee for sustaining faith and for the star of hope. We praise Thee for our Republic. Its genius assures every citizen the right to think his own thoughts, to enjoy the fruits of his own labors and to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience. We pray Thee that we may ever hold sacred these inalienable rights and guard them against all intrusions. We ask Thee, our Father, to help us cherish them in the teaching and in the spirit of our most holy faith. May we harmonize our thoughts with Thy thoughts, our ways with Thy ways, and submit our wills to Thine. Clothe us each day with the spirit of the golden rule: All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. In our Savior's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL CLERK TO THE MINORITY

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 281

Resolved, That under authority of the act making appropriations for the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1938, George P. Darrow is hereby named a special clerk to the minority of the House as successor to Joseph G. Rodgers, deceased, effective July 13, 1937.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a radio talk of mine over the Pan American radio station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

BONNEVILLE DAM

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 4 minutes and to read a telegram from the Jackson Club of Portland, Ore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the telegram is dated Portland, Ore., and reads as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., July 17, 1937.

HON. WALTER M. PIERCE,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Motion carried at regular monthly meeting, July 15, to send you the following, since you mention J. D. Ross, of Seattle, as Bonneville Dam administrator: Jackson Club of Oregon wishes to inquire which State you represent in Congress—Washington or Oregon?

CLAUDE KEMP, President.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Who sent that telegram?

Mr. PIERCE. It is from the president of the Jackson Club in Portland, Ore.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know how the gentleman from Oregon feels about it, but, in my opinion, J. D. Ross is doing more for the cause of public power in this country and for the consumers who pay the bills than almost any other man in America. He is doing more for the people of the State of Oregon and will do more for the State of Oregon than will any of those men who are criticizing him. I hope, if this bill goes through—and I believe it will—I hope the President will do the State of Oregon and the State of Washington the kindness of putting J. D. Ross in charge of it.

Let me say further that I also hope the bill for unified control goes through, in order that when Mr. Ross takes charge, or whatever administrator may be appointed takes charge, he can go ahead and operate that great plant for the benefit of the people in the far West.

Mr. PIERCE. I thank the gentleman for his statement, especially with respect to unified control at Bonneville.

Mr. Speaker, my reply to this telegram is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 20, 1937.

MR. CLAUDE KEMP,

President, Jackson Club, Portland, Ore.

MY DEAR MR. KEMP: It certainly interests me to answer your amazing telegram of July 17, 1937, which you signed as president of the Jackson Club of Oregon. I do not know what called forth this telegram, unless it might have been a report in the press that when questioned I expressed confidence in Mr. J. D. Ross, who had been mentioned by the newspapers as the possible choice of the President for administrator at Bonneville.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman states he does not know what brought forth that telegram. I think I know what brought it forth. There have been tools of the Power Trust lobbying against unified control ever since the Bonneville bill has been before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. They are trying to get control of that power for a few interests in order to shut the door in the faces of the power consumers in the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and the surrounding territory.

It is the old game of the Power Trust trying to get a monopoly of the power to be generated at one of these public projects. This is one time they are going to fail. We are going to save Bonneville for the people of that great western country.

Mr. PIERCE (reading):

I was a charter member of the Jackson Club of Oregon. Until I came to Congress I had missed only two annual meetings in a quarter of a century. I have a great affection for the club and its membership. I do not believe that a representative gathering of those members did make such an inquiry as that given in the telegram which I now quote. I am sending this letter to all the members of the Jackson Club, and want them to see the text of the telegram to which I am replying.

PORTLAND, OREG., July 17, 1937.

Motion carried at regular monthly meeting July 15 to send you the following, since you mention J. D. Ross, of Seattle, as Bonneville Dam administrator, Jackson Club of Oregon wishes to inquire which State you represent in Congress—Washington or Oregon.

CLAUDE KEMP, President,
1040 S. W. Washington.

Officially I do represent in Congress the Second District of Oregon. No one from that district has ever questioned my interest in the Bonneville matter. My interest in Bonneville legislation and administration extends far beyond the boundaries of my own district, and embraces not only the State but the welfare of the Northwest; and, above all, I desire a shining example in Bonneville for the whole country.

I am willing to trust, in the selection of administrator at Bonneville, the administration which gave us Bonneville. These criticisms and bitter expressions coming from Oregon by telegram and in the press are most unfortunate because they reflect upon the administration which is solely responsible for the project. Expressions are premature because the Bonneville bill has not yet passed Congress. It is certainly unfortunate to have the bill called for action on the coming Friday while pettiness, criticism over reported administrative choice, and contention over our great gift is the order of the day in Oregon. There should be no interstate strife over this great project. Bonneville does not belong solely to the people of Portland, nor even to Oregon and Washington. We owe it to the vision and courage of our President. To use his own words, "It is to be used as a yardstick so consumers may know the real cost of electric energy." It is national in its scope.

As far as Oregon is concerned, I am vastly more interested in the welfare of a million people than I am in a job for one.

I believe that my public life of nearly a half century in Oregon does not make it necessary for me to assure you nor the Jackson Club, nor anyone in Oregon, that I represent the people who earn their living there—laborers, the businessmen, and the farmers who keep the freight trains moving to Portland with the products of Oregon's ranches and farms. It is all Oregon and the Northwest, which builds up Portland and enables you to live and provides your profits.

I represent also those who are honest investors in private utilities, already established in Oregon, and do not wish to have them suffer further loss. The utilities are part of our business life, though they are, for the most part, sold out to holding companies now controlled in Wall Street. As their representative, I say to them in no unmistakable terms that they must quit taking advantage of people who do not have the opportunity to know what is being done in utility-ridden Portland.

You live in a city which pays excess tribute to Wall Street holding companies to the amount of \$5,000,000 a year. The current used in Portland could be furnished by the municipal plant in Tacoma for \$5,000,000 less than Portland users pay. I want to help to put that \$5,000,000 back into Portland pockets.

This bill for electric current is really paid by the farmers and the laboring men, the ultimate consumers, who cannot pass the burden along to the next fellow. The extra toll taken by the utilities in Portland is paid by all Oregon and the rest of the Northwest. You live in a State which is paying seven and one-half million dollars each year more than it would pay if Tacoma electric rates prevailed. Does it interest you to change this condition?

Would you in Portland like to meet Tacoma on equal terms in the years to come, or do you intend to continue to pay tribute? In 8 years the Tacoma public plant will be entirely free of debt and can still further reduce rates. Tacoma's municipal plant contributes 10 percent of gross income for city and State taxes. What percentage are the utilities in Portland contributing to government? I have made a real study of this matter and have tried to set it forth for your benefit in a speech in Congress June 24, this year, *The Tale of Two Cities*. I take pleasure in enclosing copy for you and all other members of your club to whom I am sending this letter.

Are you aware that the people of the entire United States are paying annually over one thousand million dollars in excess electric rate charges over and above the Tacoma electric rates? If applied to the national debt, this excess toll, at 3-percent interest, would retire the entire debt in 21 years. These excess-charge figures have been presented to Congress and to a House committee by my esteemed colleague, Hon. JOHN RANKIN, of Mississippi. The figures were checked by the Federal Power Commission and have never been successfully challenged.

If Portland were using electric current as freely as it is used in Tacoma, it would take the entire present installed capacity of Bonneville in addition to what you are now getting. Of course, you cannot use electricity as freely as it is used in Tacoma, because it now costs too much in Portland. The quantity of electricity used is a question of price. In Portland there is an annual residential consumption of 1,110 kilowatt-hours a year; in Tacoma, 1,563; in Ottawa, Canada, 3,750; Winnipeg, 4,250; and Fort William, 5,240. If Portland were using electric current as freely as they are using it in Winnipeg, Canada, it would require the entire ultimate installation at Bonneville in addition to the present current used. Electric current ought to be as cheap as water. It is one of God's gifts to men. Why should your organization yield to the propaganda of Wall Street utilities?

Now, are you people in Portland who find yourselves in such a situation more interested in securing a job for one man who happens to have a residence there than you are in solving a great problem and making Portland a more satisfactory residence place? Are you more interested that a prospective administrator shall give lip service to a political party than you are to have a man with his heart with the people instead of with the utilities?

My friends of the Jackson Club, open your eyes. I am proud of that club, which has always taken such a liberal stand for the people and against the special interests which pillage them. This conforms to the principles of our great patron, Andrew Jackson. Is the Jackson Club changing its color? Does the Jackson Club care more for the welfare of the Aluminum Trust than it cares for the people of Oregon? If not, then why this effort to thwart the administration and this criticism before it has even announced that it is ready to select a candidate for the position of administrator of Bonneville?

If the proposed Bonneville legislation becomes a law, the appointment of that administrator will be in the hands of Secretary Ickes. I am convinced that political affiliations and geographical location will have nothing at all to do with the selection. I feel sure that the Secretary, understanding the President's deep interest in Bonneville, will consult with him over this appointment, which is as important as the appointment of a judge to the Supreme Bench. It will require a man of sufficient knowledge and ability and national reputation to sustain Bonneville project successfully before the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

Certainly I am deeply interested in the selection of the administrator. I have convictions on the matter. I believe he must be an absolutely honest man whom the "spoils of office will not buy." He must not be dazzled by the glitter of the King's gold. He must honestly believe in public ownership. He must be capable, with thorough knowledge of the electrical business and demonstrated administrative ability. He must have the interests of the people at heart and accept the principle of the "yardstick" to which Bonneville is dedicated. It is my wish and prayer that the Secretary may find a man who will rise to the occasion. If an Oregon man is chosen as the one best fitted for the place, that will be pleasing to me; but I desire, above all, the welfare of all the people of Oregon. If the right man develops Bonneville, in the light of its dedication to "the more abundant life", it may be the entering wedge that will give relief to people everywhere from the oppressive rates and methods of that small holding-company group, said to be less than 200 men, which today controls the private utilities of the United States and exacts an immense toll from the people.

Members of the Jackson Club, you have something to do besides eating good dinners and promoting the spirit of good fellowship. You in Portland are facing a crisis. There is an opportunity, this year, with the expiration of the franchise of the Northwestern Electric Co., to take over that property at a reasonable valuation and enter Portland in the list of progressive cities. Those who caution delay until cost of Bonneville current is determined are obviously speaking for the utilities. Every informed person now knows that the cost of current at Bonneville will not constitute 10 percent of the price for current in Portland. Generating costs are small compared to distributing charges. The Government plant is nearly ready to deliver current. Are you ready to use it most advantageously in Portland?

Study the matter of public ownership; investigate rates and consumption and the cost of generation and distribution of electricity. I have tried to help you here in Congress. I have given weeks of careful work and study to the preparation of speeches about Bonneville, and about public ownership, and very particularly about the unfortunate situation in Portland. I have been in this power fight ever since I have been in Washington, and long before. I know something of the methods and means of those who would sabotage the public power policies of this administration. I do not wish to see my Jackson Club friends lined up with the enemies of the administration. Work with the President on this matter of Bonneville. Make your city ready for the benefits of Bonneville. Do not waste your time sending such telegrams to Members of Congress. I beg of you to devote your thought and your energies to the success of Bonneville and the welfare of Oregon.

I am in the fight and I mean to stand by my principles as a public-ownership man. It will take more than your telegram to convince me that my friends of the Jackson Club and the forward-looking men and women of Oregon are not with the administration in this great undertaking.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER M. PIERCE, M. C.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

SPANISH WAR PENSIONS

The SPEAKER. Today is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. GASQUE (when the Committee on Pensions was called). Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Pensions to call up the bill (H. R. 5030) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman what time will be allowed for discussion of the bill under this arrangement?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from California that if consent is given, the bill will be considered in the House under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. COSTELLO. Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the importance of the legislation and the amount of money involved, I shall be forced to object to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

This bill is on the Union Calendar, and, under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5030 with Mr. WOODRUM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. This bill does only two things which are clear and specific. It provides that the Spanish War veterans who have reached the age of 65 years in effect shall be declared totally and permanently disabled. In other words, it gives them a pension of \$60 a month. The large majority of the Spanish War veterans today are getting \$50 per month on a 75-percent disability. It is hard to get over that gap between 75 and 100 percent and get the Veterans' Administration to give them permanent and total disability. This Congress has gone on record in declaring that 65 years of age is total and permanent disability in the Social Security Act. We are just placing this class of veterans, most of whom are already drawing \$50 per month, in the position to draw \$60 per month when they reach the age of 65.

Then it does one other thing, and that is all. The Spanish War veteran now who is totally and permanently disabled and is bedridden, or who needs care and attendance of a third person at all times, is now getting \$72 per month. Under this bill we give him \$100 per month. These are the rates that were given to the Civil War veterans at approximately the same age. These Spanish War veterans were long neglected. It was a long time before they were even recognized and given anything, and we are only trying to treat them as we have treated the Union Army veterans in years gone by.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What is the average age of the Spanish War veteran now?

Mr. GASQUE. Sixty-two years.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. I note that in order to receive the higher pension of \$100 per month the veteran must be one who is shown to need the constant aid and attendance of another person.

Mr. GASQUE. That is correct.

Mr. DOWELL. May I suggest to the gentleman that in many cases that have come to my attention the Department appears to be not favorable to this provision, and wherever there is an excuse to hold that a veteran is not entitled to the aid of someone else it is denied.

Mr. GASQUE. That is correct.

Mr. DOWELL. Can the gentleman give us any information with reference to any way in which this can be prevented where one really needs attendance?

Mr. GASQUE. It would be impossible for me to do that, because I know personally of cases where they do need the

aid and attendance of another person, but the Veterans' Administration cannot be convinced of it.

Mr. DOWELL. Under the construction that the Department gives the law the person must be absolutely helpless.

Mr. GASQUE. That is the construction; yes.

Mr. DOWELL. With that condition, it seems to me that that provision is not being carried out in the spirit of the legislation.

Mr. GASQUE. And it is the purpose of this legislation to see that it is carried out.

Mr. DOWELL. But the provision in this bill is identical with the language in the bill that is not being carried out; and I am wondering if we are going to improve that condition insofar as one who receives the higher pension is concerned.

Mr. GASQUE. I know that the Department is very sympathetic toward this legislation. While they do not recommend it, they are sympathetic to it, and I believe I can take it up with the Department and see that they do carry out the spirit of the legislation.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman, as chairman of this committee, intercede for these pensioners and ascertain if the Department will not be more lenient in granting an attendant, and not wait until the pensioner is on his deathbed before the attendant is provided?

Mr. GASQUE. I assure the gentleman that I will, and I have already done that with regard to other veterans and have had very good results.

Mr. DOWELL. I know there are a number of cases where I am sure the attendant ought to be provided and where the Department has turned it down. This bill should pass, and these veterans should receive the benefits provided in this legislation.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Is this act intended to be an amendment to the present Spanish-American Pension Act, or is this act entirely new?

Mr. GASQUE. This is a new act entirely.

Mr. SNELL. How does this affect the present act on the statute books?

Mr. GASQUE. It does not affect it.

Mr. SNELL. If a man draws a pension under the old act, is there anything to prohibit him getting in under this act?

Mr. GASQUE. Nothing at all. He has a right to elect under which he will come.

Mr. SNELL. There is nothing in this which says he is withdrawn from under the old act?

Mr. GASQUE. Not a thing.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me that this ought to be an amendment to the original act rather than a new act, and not repeal the old act.

Mr. GASQUE. This does not repeal the old act.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman thinks there is no possibility of a man's coming in under both?

Mr. GASQUE. No; he could not do that.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Section 5 provides that nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to diminish or reduce any pension heretofore granted.

Mr. SNELL. I can see that. Now, we are liberalizing the pension act for the Spanish-American War veterans, are we not?

Mr. GASQUE. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me this should be an amendment to the original act, rather than an entirely new act, and then you would not have any complications.

Mr. GASQUE. I do not think any complications will be reached. However, I do not think there would be any objection to it being offered as an amendment.

Mr. SNELL. Certainly we have never done it this way before. I am for the act. However, I believe it should be an amendment to the original act, rather than an entirely new act granting new pensions.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Has the gentleman the figures indicating how much the pensions were that we paid to the Civil War veterans when we raised them to \$100 a month? What I want to point out is this: Is it not a fact that the amount which the Government paid to the Civil War veterans when they were raised to \$100 a month was far greater than it will be to these Spanish-American War veterans, because they are fewer in number?

Mr. GASQUE. Absolutely, that is true. I do not have the figures with me, however.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. In section 4 of the act it is provided that no one while an inmate of a United States soldiers' home or any National or State soldiers' home shall be paid more than \$50 a month under this act. I can see the justice of that provision when a veteran is in a national home, but I cannot see the justice of it when a man is in a State soldiers' home. If there should be any offset, that should go to the State and not to the National Government. If a man is entitled to \$60 and he goes into a State institution, it seems to me if that \$10 is taken from his compensation it ought to go to the State that maintains that home and not be credited to the Federal Government.

Mr. GASQUE. That language is the language of the present law.

Mr. BOILEAU. I know it is, but it seems to me that those States which have State homes are being discriminated against. I do not see why that should be in the law. It seems to me it is objectionable in the present law, and we should not perpetuate it here. If they are in a State home and this deduction is made, it seems to me it should go to the State.

Mr. GASQUE. That might complicate matters to do that, because there are other classes of veterans that this does not take in.

Mr. BOILEAU. The Federal Government does not make contributions to the State homes, so why should the Federal Government get the benefit of this \$10?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. GASQUE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. As a former director of the California Veterans' Home, I know the Federal Government contributes \$10 a month for every inmate that we have in our institutions. That, no doubt, accounts for the deduction of \$10 for those who are occupying State homes, such as the California Veterans' Home.

Mr. GASQUE. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. If what the gentleman from California says is true, then this is equitable. I was under the impression that was not the situation.

It seems to me we should have that clarified. That may have been the regulation at the time the gentleman from California refers to, but it is my understanding that it is not the regulation now.

Mr. GASQUE. I undoubtedly would think so because of the present law.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman agree with me that if that is not the case, that provision should not apply to State homes?

Mr. GASQUE. I agree with the gentleman heartily.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Can the gentleman give us the figures on what this increase will cost; also, what it is now costing?

Mr. GASQUE. I do not have the figures right now as to the present cost, but I am going to read a brief explanation of the bill, which will give those figures.

The Veterans' Administration in their report submitted two reports. The first report was based on the age of 62 years instead of 65. They recommended four amendments to that bill. The second report was based on the age of 65. They suggested we make the age 65. This amendment was adopted by the committee.

The figures used in the second report from the Veterans' Administration were used in the committee report on the bill H. R. 5030, which was reported out of committee. This report shows that section 1 of the bill gave a pension of \$60 per month to all veterans 65 years of age. Twenty-three thousand three hundred veterans would be affected, and the additional cost \$4,876,000 for those now on the rolls.

I want you to follow this next paragraph.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in his report states that he believes that a group of approximately 13,350 additional veterans who are not now receiving a pension would be entitled to the \$60.

Should this group of 13,350 veterans file claims it would mean an additional cost of \$4,800,000. Mr. Means, who is chairman of the legislative committee of the Spanish War Veterans, stated in the hearings that that is impossible, that many veterans never having applied for pensions since the Spanish War are either dead, forgotten, or do not care for a pension. We know that that many will not apply.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GASQUE. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. In addition to what the gentleman is saying, is it not true that the Spanish War veteran was not accorded hospitalization until 1928, or about 30 years after his separation from the service.

Mr. GASQUE. I was going to bring that out.

Mr. THURSTON. Whereas the World War veteran had those advantages and facilities immediately upon discharge.

Mr. GASQUE. Neither was he given the benefit of World War insurance.

Mr. THURSTON. Nor was any provision made for the care of his dependents.

Mr. GASQUE. None whatever. The report dealing with section 2 of the bill shows that there are 2,585 who will receive \$100 a month pension. This will mean an additional cost of \$873,000. The total cost of the bill is shown by the Administrator's report, leaving out that 13,350, to be \$5,749,000. This amount was used in the committee report. The reason the other item was not used is as I have previously explained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SNELL. I am not opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire if any Member present is opposed to the bill?

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill and desire to be recognized in opposition to the bill if nobody on the minority side is opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California in opposition to the bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed in any way to the provisions of this bill. I am in favor of them, but I am very firm in my conviction that this is not the best way in which to accomplish what the committee desires. In the case of all other changes in pension laws they have been

made by way of amendment of the existing statute. While I do not think that any beneficiary will ever draw two pensions, one under each of these bills, I am very sure it would be much better legislative procedure either to repeal the old law or to offer this as an amendment to the original Spanish War pension law; and I ask the chairman of the committee to give that serious consideration before he passes this bill in its present form.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield to me for a question?

Mr. COSTELLO. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. TABER. I have in front of me the statute with reference to Spanish War pensions, and I would like to have the attention of the Chairman of the Committee as I go along on this, if I may. The statute under which pensions are paid at the present time is contained in Public, 299, of the Seventy-first Congress. It provides a certain sliding scale of pension rates. There is nothing in the pending bill and nothing in the original bill which would prevent a beneficiary being paid a pension under Public, No. 299, of the Seventy-first Congress and in addition a pension under the bill now before us.

Is the gentleman prepared to accept an amendment to section 4?

Mr. GASQUE. It is my understanding that the existing law prevents the drawing of two pensions.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman cite me to such a statute?

Mr. GASQUE. I cannot quote it right now.

Mr. TABER. I think that should be shown to the House, because I do not think we ought to pass this legislation under which two pensions might be drawn.

Mr. GASQUE. I know there is existing law providing that no person may draw two pensions.

Mr. TABER. What if he be entitled to it under two separate statutes? I would like to see the statute to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. GASQUE. I would remind the gentleman that the pending bill affects but one class of Spanish War veterans, those who have reached age 65. A man cannot become a beneficiary under this bill unless he is 65 years old or older.

Mr. TABER. At the same time a man 65 years of age or older could come under this and the other bill, too, the way the pending bill is drawn.

Mr. GASQUE. Oh, no.

Mr. TABER. This bill is not an amendment to the other statute.

Mr. GASQUE. This bill provides that he cannot do that.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; it does not anywhere.

Mr. GASQUE. The interpretation of the existing law is implied in section 4 of this bill. I cite section 4715 of the Revised Statutes, United States Code 38, section 25.

Mr. TABER. There is not anything specifically there to say that.

Mr. GASQUE. There is nothing in this bill, but I will try to show the gentleman that we have existing law that provides that a man cannot draw two pensions. Under no condition may they draw two pensions.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that this bill, instead of being an amendment to existing law and getting the whole pension legislation in reference to Spanish War veterans in one place, where the rulings of the Veterans' Bureau as already made would apply, sets up a new statute and a new pension law, which will require additional construction. It is so worded that duplicate pensions may be paid unless there is some provision that I have been unable to find to the contrary.

Mr. GASQUE. I may say to the gentleman if he is worrying about that, I shall be glad to accept an amendment to that effect.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman from South Carolina would accept an amendment at page 3, line 21, of this act by adding to the bill a provision that any pension received by any person under the provisions of this act shall be in lieu of all other pensions?

Mr. GASQUE. I will be glad to accept it.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a question, and I should like also to have the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE]. It seems to me that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is intended to mean exactly as he stated, but I am afraid it should be polished up somewhat, because it may cause the individual who has already filed his claim and whose papers are on file to make a new claim entirely. This language should be to the effect that this law automatically encompasses all pensions. That is, it takes them all in.

Mr. TABER. But it does not.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. It ought to be that way.

Mr. TABER. May I say to the gentleman this only applies to certain individual cases among Spanish War veterans. It does not apply to all of them, and if that provision is put in we would wipe out and repeal a large number of the pensions that have already been granted now under Public, No. 299, of the Seventy-first Congress.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. This bill applies to certain individuals.

I do not think we should pass an amendment or any kind of law which would provide that those individuals have to come in and make new claims. This law should say that an individual in this class will automatically be entitled to such-and-such a pension. If there is any controversy about a man drawing two pensions, of course, that is not what we want. This other amendment goes too far the other way, and I think the gentlemen should get together, because if they do not I am afraid we will not have a bill.

Mr. TABER. My criticism of this bill is that, instead of going down the line and amending the existing statute with reference to Spanish War veterans, it sets up a new law entirely and leaves the old law on the statute books. That is a very bad way to legislate. If we would amend the old statute by increasing the rate for those above 65, we would then permit the Veterans' Bureau to go on and operate with the claims that are already on file there, and they would have to only consider the amendment as to amount with reference to specific cases; but if we go to work and pass this bill the way it is written, they will have to request new applications. There is no way of getting out of that. That is the trouble with this legislation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That would be very unfortunate.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. May I ask the Committee on Pensions what has been the position of the Veterans' Administration in reference to duplicate pensions?

Mr. GASQUE. The Veterans' Administration has gone over this bill carefully and has helped us to rewrite it so far as amendments are concerned and has helped us in perfecting the bill. This bill deals with only one class of Spanish-American War veterans. It does not touch all of them. It specifically states it does not apply to any except the man who has reached 65 years of age. Regardless of the amendment I agreed to awhile ago—and I expect to accept the amendment—I feel it is not necessary, because there is legislation already on the statute books which provides that nobody may receive two pensions. I cannot conceive of any Member of Congress who does not know that a man cannot draw two pensions at the same time.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, it may seem just a little rash for an individual to rise on the floor in opposition to legislation dealing with veterans. However, in view of the position I have occupied in this House as one of the official objectors to bills on the Consent Calendar, may I say this legislation came before me in that official capacity and as a

result it was incumbent upon me to make a study of the legislation in order to determine its merit. If I considered the bill meritorious, then I would not interpose an objection when it was called up for consideration on the Consent Calendar. Since this bill requires large annual expenditures and establishes a dangerous age precedent, I opposed its passage by unanimous consent, believing that the membership should at least have an opportunity to learn what the bill proposes to do.

This bill involves a considerable amount of money. It sets up a definite standard of pensions to be paid to veterans, and I think the Members of the House are entitled to some information as to exactly what they are doing in regard to veterans' legislation, because what we do for one group of veterans we will undoubtedly be called upon to do the same thing for all other groups of veterans.

The very first section of this bill provides that—

All persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition between the dates of April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom—

And so forth. That is the first group of people. In other words, the question of need and the question of disability does not enter into the picture at all. It is purely a question of age.

You have been told that the precedent upon which this proposed legislation is based is what we have done in the past for the veterans of the Civil War. May I call to your attention the fact that after the Civil War it was 55 years before we passed legislation of this character? In other words, it was 55 years after the end of that war before we passed a general pension law, and that law, mind you, provided pensions to all Civil War veterans regardless of age, because the average age of the Civil War veterans at that time was approximately 75 years. Now, with that as a precedent, you are being asked to pass, for the Spanish-American War veterans, legislation which will give such veterans a blanket pension of \$60 a month, and this pension is based upon the age of the veteran. It was not until the Spanish-American War that the question of age was introduced as a basis on which pensions should be paid. In other words, any veteran who reaches the age of 65 years is entitled to receive a pension under this legislation, regardless of disability. This principle I believe to be wrong.

Moreover, it is not 55 years since the Spanish War. That war ended in 1902 officially. You are being asked to do this for the Spanish War veterans exactly 35 years after the termination of that war. You are being asked to do this 20 years sooner than it was done for the Civil War veterans in the precedent on which this committee is relying for the passage of the pending legislation.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman certainly recognizes the fact that there is a vast difference between the period 55 years after the Civil War and this period, 35 years after the Spanish-American War, so far as economic opportunities are concerned. Men of 65 in those days could earn a living; but men of 65 today are incapacitated, whether physically disabled or not, for earning a living.

After all, we are pensioning these men so they may eat. Today an able-bodied man of 65 for all practical purposes is incapacitated for earning a living. Does the gentleman want these men to be dependent on charity? May I ask the gentleman what solution he offers?

Mr. COSTELLO. I simply suggest to the gentleman that in this particular bill the question of need of the individual is not brought in at all because it is purely a matter of age. The gentleman himself brings out the point that being 65 years old incapacitates a man. If this be true, then why not

grant a \$60 pension to all persons who are 65, in order that they all may eat, independent of charity? If this is the situation, then why not do the same thing for the World War veterans? Certainly the conditions under which the Spanish War veterans of 65 years of age are laboring today are absolutely no different from the conditions under which the World War veterans are forced to exist at the present time.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GASQUE. The World War veterans have no better friend than I, and I am not against them; but the gentleman knows the World War veteran was given a pension from the time he got out of the Army. He was given a bonus; he was given hospitalization; and he was given almost everything else that could be done for him. We are not asking all this for the Spanish War veteran. We waited approximately 20 years before we did anything for him. It was not until just a few years ago that we even let the Spanish War veteran have hospitalization.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit, I think the gentleman did not realize that he stated the World War veterans were given a pension from the time they were discharged. They were not. Only the service-connected cases were given a pension, and only those men who are disabled now receive pensions.

Mr. GASQUE. I agree with that statement.

What I meant to say is that no precedent is being set by this bill, because this has been done before. We are not trying to set any precedent at all; we are following a precedent. We are trying to right a wrong that has been done the Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman stated we are not setting a precedent, but I disagree on that very point. In the case of the Civil War veterans the matter of age was not introduced. Those veterans were all at least on the average 75 years of age. Now we are putting in a specific age proviso of 65 years.

May I show the House exactly what may be anticipated if this legislation is enacted into law? Regardless of what you may have done for the Civil War veterans, regardless of the comparative basis of benefits received by Spanish-American War veterans and World War veterans, the fact is that when you bestow a benefit upon any group the members of any similar group are going to think they are entitled to the same benefit. They are not going to say, "Well, I had something different, and therefore I am not entitled to this benefit. I have received mine." Quite the contrary; they are going to say, "If you did this for the Civil War veterans and did it for the Spanish War veterans, then do it for the World War veterans."

I asked the Veterans' Administration to prepare for me figures as to what this proposed legislation would cost in the event I were to offer an amendment to the bill, adding, on the first page, after the enumeration of the classes of service covered, the words "or the World War." It might astound the Members of the House to know that in 1937 there are 12,939 World War veterans who have already reached the age of 65 years. If this legislation were passed, giving them \$60 a month, the increase in cost to the Government over what they may now be receiving, in order to pay these veterans \$60 a month, would amount to more than \$7,500,000 the first year. If you follow that increase on through, taking a complete chart, which I intend to insert in the Record, showing the ages of World War veterans, you will find it will be 1996 when the last World War veteran of the age of 65 is left in this Nation. The peak under such a proposal would be reached in the year 1963, at which time there will be 2,213,841 World War veterans aged 65. The cost in that one year alone of this type of legislation, over and above the cost of existing veterans' legislation, would be \$1,299,596,000. This is exactly the precedent you are

establishing by this bill. The estimates to which I refer are as follows:

Estimated additional annual cost of paying a pension of \$60 per month to World War veterans who have attained age 65 years, by years, from 1937 to 1996

Year	Estimated number living at beginning of year, age 65 and over	Estimated additional annual cost
1937	12,939	\$7,591,404
1938	15,652	9,183,102
1939	18,538	10,876,098
1940	21,729	12,748,290
1941	25,688	15,070,811
1942	29,690	17,419,075
1943	35,538	20,849,867
1944	42,194	24,755,393
1945	49,879	29,263,698
1946	56,850	33,354,103
1947	65,542	38,453,486
1948	76,323	44,778,821
1949	88,825	52,113,467
1950	104,042	61,041,483
1951	128,401	75,385,817
1952	223,040	130,931,748
1953	339,119	199,073,853
1954	477,515	280,316,622
1955	630,432	370,084,216
1956	793,326	465,707,760
1957	987,007	579,404,977
1958	1,211,790	711,360,078
1959	1,467,265	861,332,018
1960	1,751,148	1,027,980,509
1961	2,059,036	1,208,720,922
1962	2,308,093	1,396,222,495
1963	2,513,841	1,599,596,787
1964	2,694,803	1,828,420,804
1965	2,859,875	2,084,435,324
1966	3,000,507	2,368,492,196
1967	3,142,197	2,681,429,250
1968	3,293,290	2,994,016,271
1969	3,454,434	3,307,220,113
1970	3,629,784	3,621,719,110
1971	3,817,485	3,938,184,243
1972	4,018,618	4,257,252,058
1973	4,232,196	4,579,515,971
1974	4,459,150	4,905,522,932
1975	4,694,333	5,235,773,750
1976	4,938,534	5,570,731,126
1977	5,191,457	5,910,808,277
1978	5,453,704	6,256,359,585
1979	5,725,886	6,607,134,822
1980	6,008,470	6,962,276,433
1981	6,299,443	7,321,516,710
1982	6,598,550	7,685,705,542
1983	6,905,356	8,054,887,844
1984	7,220,280	8,429,023,278
1985	7,543,567	8,808,167,532
1986	7,875,252	9,191,267,271
1987	8,215,185	9,578,361,167
1988	8,563,138	9,969,428,428
1989	8,919,890	10,364,503,603
1990	9,284,325	10,763,042,426
1991	9,657,455	11,165,083,853
1992	10,039,559	11,570,687,968
1993	10,430,179	11,979,314,976
1994	10,829,455	12,391,026,077
1995	11,236,888	12,805,774,680
1996	11,652,669	13,223,611,669

In general figures the total cost of such a proposal for the World War veterans would aggregate more than \$20,000,000,000. The World War has already cost this Nation over \$60,000,000,000, and by applying the terms of this legislation to World War veterans, we would add another twenty billion. The veterans' share of the cost of the World War amounts to \$12,000,000,000. This is divided approximately as follows:

Payments for disabilities	\$2,750,000,000
Payments for death benefits	500,000,000
For military and naval insurance	2,000,000,000
For the soldiers' bonus	3,500,000,000
For hospitalization	1,250,000,000
For vocational training	500,000,000

The World War veterans are going to be able to make not only as strong a case as do the Spanish War veterans, demanding such legislation, but a much stronger case, because they will say that you did it for the Civil War veterans, and you went further and did it for the Spanish War veterans. We, too, now are reaching the age of 65; why, then, should you not do the same thing for us of the World War?

The question is sometimes brought up that nothing has been done for the Spanish War veterans. In the hearings

that were held in 1932 before a joint investigating committee, the question of the cost of the Spanish War was entered into, and that war cost this Nation \$582,000,000, and pensions have been paid up to September 30, 1932, in respect of Spanish War veterans, in the amount of \$715,921,664.51. This amounts to more than \$45,000 per casualty of that war.

In that year the current appropriation for Spanish War veterans was \$116,000,000. In addition there was \$3,000,000 for hospitalization, and in all an appropriation of \$119,396,447.

On October 31, 1932, 235,306 Spanish War pensions were being paid; 196,618 were for veterans, 38,150 were pensions for widows and other alleged dependents, and 538 were for nurses.

I mention these figures simply to give you somewhat of the picture of the number of veterans of the Spanish War who are at the present time receiving pensions.

If you read the report of the committee on this bill, you will find they refer to the hearings and they state that the cost of the first section of the bill, according to the Veterans' Administration, would amount to approximately \$4,876,000 over and above the amount that you are now paying Spanish War veterans.

What this bill does is to take a pension of about \$40 a month and increase it to \$60 a month; in other words, at the present time the Spanish War veteran of the age of 68 is receiving \$40 a month.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAAS. I think the statement of the gentleman is beside the point. We are not incorporating a new principle of veterans' legislation in this bill; we are simply recognizing realities and increasing their pension by a small amount to compensate them for the loss of economic opportunity and increased cost of living. There is not a single new precedent established by this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman that so far as the question of age is concerned, they may not be establishing a precedent, but it was out of this committee and in reference to the Spanish War veterans that the Congress first incorporated in veterans' legislation the question of age, and by passing this legislation we are simply continuing to recognize that precedent of establishing pensions not on the basis of need, not on the basis of disability, but solely on the basis of age. Further, I may state to the gentleman that, undoubtedly, here in this very legislative body there are veterans of the Spanish-American War, and there is absolutely no provision in this bill that would deny them, if they are 65 years of age, the right of receiving this \$60 a month.

Mr. MAAS. But the gentleman realizes there are very few veterans of the Spanish-American War of 65 years of age who are not in need of this pension. The majority of them are disabled and the committee took that into consideration. The committee also took into consideration the matter of need, and we have come to the conclusion that the most equitable, fair, American way to determine need for the Spanish-American War veterans is age, and I think you will find that it very closely coincides with need. General Hines, in testifying before our committee, stated that from 90 to 95 percent of these Spanish-American War veterans of 65 are in need. We wanted to get away from the un-American pauper's oath which I think is repugnant to all of us, and I believe this is a far more intelligent and American-like solution of the problem.

Mr. COSTELLO. I may state to the gentleman in that connection that I intend to offer an amendment at the end of the first section of the bill that will provide that any person who has paid an income tax during the preceding year would not be entitled to receive a pension under this legislation.

I think on that basis it will tend to eliminate many of those who may have received an income on which they have to pay an income tax, and would deprive them of an

opportunity of receiving a pension under this legislation. But I call to the attention of the House exactly what is happening to the veterans' legislation. The committee report shows that 23,300 veterans under this first section of the bill would cost the Government in increased pensions the sum of \$4,876,000. However, the committee report does not give you the additional testimony of the Veterans' Administration, although the chairman of the committee did refer to it.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there will be an additional 13,350 veterans who are not now receiving a pension but who have attained the age of 65 years and who would be entitled to \$60 a month under this bill. In the event that they should apply for their pension, an additional annual cost of \$4,806,000 will be added to the cost of this bill. As a result, the granting of that pension to all 65 years of age, whether disabled or not, at \$60 a month will mean approximately an annual increased sum totaling \$9,682,000 over and above the pensions now being paid to this same group of veterans.

The second portion of the bill, which refers to those veterans who are in need of attendants, would grant to some 2,585 veterans an increased pension that would total approximately \$873,000 additional. All in all, the cost of this one piece of legislation is going to amount to \$10,555,000 during the first year. Ultimately, when this legislation, being in effect, reaches the peak, it is going to cost approximately \$20,000,000 a year. In other words, the number of Spanish War veterans who are going to be entitled to these benefits is constantly increasing and will increase until 1946, when the peak of the Spanish War veterans will be reached.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. I think the gentleman is in error and has misunderstood the facts, because the figure \$10,555,000 is predicated on 13,350 additional Spanish War veterans applying for this pension. Many of that number are duplications—that is, men who reenlisted. There are 13,350 who have not applied under existing pension laws, and there is no reason to believe that they or any considerable number of them will apply because of the \$10 increase. The actual facts are that the cost of this legislation will be \$5,700,000.

Mr. COSTELLO. That is totally ignoring every one of the 13,550 cases. It is true the Spanish War organization disputes with the Veterans' Administration about how many of those cases might apply. The figure I have given is the maximum figure. It just depends upon how many of those 13,350 do apply as to whether this additional cost of \$4,806,000 will be reached.

Mr. MAAS. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair. He made an absolute statement that the cost would be \$10,000,000 and he knows that this is in all likelihood double the cost.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am making that statement from the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration before the committee. In other words, if these 13,350 do apply, they will add \$4,806,000 to the cost of this legislation, and I might state that the Veterans' Administration in computing these tables and making their estimates, I think the gentleman will find, is correct within 85 percent of the figure. In other words, I do not think the Veterans' Administration has made many errors in computing a table like this, where they have taken into consideration the number of the veterans existing at the end of the war, considering the insurance tables, American mortality tables, and similar tables, to arrive at their figures, and they have reached these figures as a result of such study. The truth of the matter is that the predictions of the Veterans' Administration regarding the number of persons to be affected and the costs to be incurred by legislation are only too often too accurate, as is realized a few years after the legislation is passed.

Mr. MAAS. There is this difference between the records kept in the World War and the service records of the Spanish War, and the Veterans' Administration records are not comparable for these two groups. Many of those 13,350 are duplications. A man has been counted twice because he has

reenlisted. There are not that many veterans, in fact. Anyway, for 20 years the men on this list have not applied, and they are not going to apply now, certainly not all of them, just because of a \$10-a-month increase.

Mr. COSTELLO. The likelihood is that all will not apply, but the fact is that this legislation can cost ten and a half million dollars a year. The gentleman admits that the minimum cost is in excess of \$5,000,000, and even if we were to split the difference, it would run to seven and a half million dollars.

There is one other point I want to call to the attention of the House, and that is this: You are increasing the pension for the disabled veteran who reaches the age of 65 and now you are taking the veteran who is not disabled and you are doing exactly the same thing for him. You are making absolutely no distinction between the man who is actually disabled and the man who is not, and it seems to me that there can be no question as to the need for a disabled veteran having a pension and certainly he should be entitled to more than the physically fit, able-bodied veteran who happens to be within the age limit, and, therefore, could apply for such pension.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. GASQUE. I would like the gentleman to state to this Committee if he believes there are very many living men today 65 years of age who are not to some extent disabled.

Mr. COSTELLO. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into that particular question. I think it has been much discussed in many fields. It has been brought up in regard to our Supreme Court Justices. You will find that men 65 years of age are still serving as presidents of corporations, members of boards of directors, and in very active capacities. The question of when an individual is going to reach a period of uselessness is a question that can be determined only by a study of individual cases.

Mr. GASQUE. But the pension bureaus take into consideration physical disabilities.

Mr. COSTELLO. But in your legislation the only requirement is an honorable discharge and the age of 65 years. Nothing more is needed in order for them to come under the terms of this legislation. If he is in need, if he is disabled, there is no question but what he is entitled to a pension; but where he is neither in need nor disabled, then I raise the question as to whether such legislation should be passed.

Just digressing for a moment from this particular bill, which may cause an increase of some \$10,000,000 annually, and reaching a peak of possibly \$20,000,000 in some future year, there are innumerable pieces of veterans' legislation pending at this time before the Congress. Some are still in committee. Many have been reported out. Some are before this House for consideration.

There is an important piece of legislation, H. R. 6384, a bill that has been improperly called the "gold-star mothers bill." In that bill the gold-star mothers are a part, but a very small part, of the total number of people who are to be taken care of under that legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I decline to yield at this moment.

The purpose of that legislation is to increase pension benefits. It changes existing law. As a result it is going to cost this Government approximately \$8,952,000 the first year if that legislation is enacted into law.

Another bill dealing with disabled emergency officers of the World War was presented in Congress and passed by the other body. If that bill becomes law the increased cost will be \$3,696,000 annually.

A third bill, S. 2219, dealing with pensions for widows of Civil War veterans, and on which hearings have been held in the other body, the Veterans' Administration estimates will cost \$10,228,000 a year.

Another bill, H. R. 6294, dealing with mental and physical disabilities, will cost somewhere between seven and eight million dollars.

Just those few bills alone that I have enumerated, presented before this very session of Congress, if enacted into law at this session, would total an increased cost to Veterans' Administration of some \$40,876,000 annually.

Now, let me call to your attention the fact that the Veterans' Administration at the present time is costing annually approximately \$500,000,000. If we are going to take up in every session of Congress some half dozen bills that may mean an added cost to this Government for veterans' legislation anywhere from ten to fifty million dollars, you can readily see where we are tending.

It is my thought that the veterans are entitled to adequate compensation. They are entitled to decent pensions, but we as a Congress should have some definite policy. We should know exactly what we are doing and in what direction we are tending and what is going to be the effect of the legislation we are passing.

In that connection I have introduced a resolution—House Joint Resolution 442—proposing that a new investigation be made by a joint congressional committee of five Senators and five Representatives to study this question of veterans' legislation, particularly in regard to World War veterans, and to study the Veterans' Administration, and see if we cannot evolve a definite program and a definite policy, so that we will know what we are attempting to do, and we will not come in here in a haphazard manner, put through legislation for Civil War veterans which, when we finally bring it down into terms of the World War, may bring about the bankruptcy of the Treasury, or it may bring about this situation: If we continue to introduce pieces of legislation at random, setting up dangerous precedents, you may find that the cost of veterans' legislation may become so great that the public of the country will revolt against making such demands, and as a result will begin to demand the wiping out or a terrific curtailment of veterans' benefits. In short, the public may soon demand a new economy act, only they may demand far more drastic reductions and economies than were made in that act. I think, in the interest of the veterans themselves, in the interest of our own lawmaking capacity, a thorough investigation should be made.

In connection with the Veterans' Administration you have a situation where the Veterans' Administration not only passes upon the executive functions, in determining the payments that are to be made, but they also act as a quasi-judicial body. It is my thought that those two functions should be separated and not handled by the identical bureau.

Mr. Chairman, I do not anticipate that any veterans' legislation that has behind it the insistent demands of veterans' organizations will be defeated. I anticipate that this House will pass this legislation, but in doing so once again let me remind you that you are doing something that is going to establish a precedent for World War veterans just as you did 55 years after the Civil War, and just as you are now doing 35 years after the Spanish-American War, and the World War veterans are going to come in here and make exactly the same demands upon you. They are not going to wait 35 years; they are going to make a demand within 25 years. Because with the depression, because of the changed economic conditions of which the gentleman spoke, they are going to make that demand upon you, and if you do not resist this demand I can assure you that you are not going to be in position to resist the demand that the World War veterans will make upon you possibly in the next session or certainly within the next 2 or 3 years.

In conclusion I also want to point out one additional fact, that this bill does not have the approval of the Budget. The possibility is that without such approval this legislation may be vetoed. If you vote for the bill now, you should also keep in mind the fact that if the other body also passes the legislation it may come back to you with a veto message, and then you would be called upon to override that veto if you want the legislation. You should keep that in mind in voting on the bill at this time.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. MASSINGALE. The gentleman seems to be greatly alarmed lest the World War veterans also ask favors something similar to the favors granted the soldiers of the Civil War and that we are about to give to the soldiers of the Spanish-American War. I wish the gentleman would tell us, if the gentleman can, why they should not do it if they want to when the time comes.

Mr. COSTELLO. For the very simple reason, as I have already pointed out, that the cost of such a thing is absolutely prohibitive. If this same legislation is enacted for the World War veterans, the total cost over the period of years will exceed \$20,000,000,000. The Government cannot afford to pay veterans' benefits for World War veterans, for a group which is 65 years of age; but that is exactly what you will be called upon to do if you pass this bill.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Does not the gentleman think that this is the wrong place to begin to economize on Government expenditures?

Mr. COSTELLO. Might I ask the gentleman if it is a question of economizing or is it a question of simply allowing the existing pension laws to remain as they are? A Spanish War veteran who is at the present time aged 68 receives \$40 a month. A Spanish War veteran aged 75 receives \$60 a month. In other words, it is not a question of economizing; it is simply a question of digging a little deeper into the Treasury and appropriating more money, of becoming a little more extravagant, being extravagant in a matter that may cause us to rue our extravagance and regret 2 or 3 years from now that we were extravagant today, because tomorrow's extravagance will run into the billions of dollars. As I pointed out, if you do this for the World War veteran, there are nearly 13,000 of them now, in 1937. The last one will come along in 1996 and he will cost \$669. In other words, over that long period of years such legislation will cost the huge sum of over twenty billions; in fact, it would exceed a billion dollars annual cost for a period of 8 years.

If you pass this legislation now, there is no question but what you are going to have to pass similar legislation for the World War veteran.

Mr. MASSINGALE. If the gentleman wants me to answer that as a question, I may say that I believe in treating them all alike. I am not interested in economy in 1996, nor do I believe that the gentleman from California is.

Mr. COSTELLO. I can assure the gentleman that in 1996 there will be no need for economy, for then the last World War veteran will be in existence and he will have cost us \$669. But during the preceding 60 years the total amount will be twenty billions if this type of legislation is enacted into law for the World War veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think that General Hines gives too high estimates on bills that come up affecting the Veterans' Administration? I have found many times that he has said the cost will be very much greater than it turned out to be.

Mr. COSTELLO. It is my understanding that the estimates that have come from the Veterans' Administration have been 85 percent accurate; in other words, their figures as to numbers and as to cost have been right within 85 percent. Moreover, the Veterans' Administration has no desire to augment the estimated costs of proposed legislation; they are merely attempting to give to the Congress as accurate an estimate as it is possible for them to make. On the other hand, a veteran organization might want to minimize the cost as much as possible, as has been done in this instance.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should be very much interested in showing the gentleman some correspondence regarding legislation I proposed which they said would cost \$72,000,000. A few years later a similar bill was introduced—the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] knows about

it—and the cost was supposed to be \$49,000,000. There was great inaccuracy in the figures somewhere.

Mr. COSTELLO. In some instances there may have been mistakes, and perhaps some very large mistakes. They may be due to error, but we must remember it is a very difficult task to attempt to estimate the administrative cost of veterans' legislation. In regard to this particular bill there is no dispute as to the first figure, namely, the \$4,886,000 annual cost starting the first year, nor is there dispute as to the \$800,000. The only question is as to the remaining \$4,806,000. That amount may be somewhat excessive in the event that all of the 13,350 not now on the pension rolls do not apply. If they do apply, the Veterans' Administration figures will be 100 percent accurate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. General Hines did not recommend against the passage of this bill, did he?

Mr. COSTELLO. General Hines and the Veterans' Administration at no time recommend the favorable passage or the nonpassage of legislation. They serve simply as an administrative body. They will find the facts for any Member of Congress or for the veterans' committees, but it is not their function to recommend for or against legislation, and they have always refrained from taking any such stand. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think there is undue alarm on the part of the gentleman from California both as to the precedent that is being established, in his view, and in the cost.

In the first place there is no precedent being established at all. The precedent was established by the Congress long ago, when it first granted the Spanish-American War pensions. That is not the issue here.

The question is whether we are going to carry out congressional policy. The policy has already, long ago, been determined that we are going to give a pension to these veterans who served their country and who today are in dire need of food, clothing, and shelter. The economic conditions have so changed that these veterans today are not getting that pension which it was the intention of Congress they should have. This was through no fault of their own. The difference between the amount these men are receiving today and the amounts proposed in this bill, which are a very modest increase, is exactly the difference between the inability to live decently as Americans and the ability to just about get by, which is all we are attempting to provide.

Today these veterans who receive \$40 a month, for illustration, cannot live on that amount. If we give \$60 at the age of 65 they can live, not in luxury, but at least in decency.

We should pay them a pension which will enable them to live in decency or else repeal the whole pension and throw them all back onto charity. We cannot have them half on charity and half on pension. To continue the present inadequate rates is the cruelest thing in the world because today these men are getting a pension which is not enough to subsist on, yet they cannot get work because of their age. They cannot get any help from the community chests or other places because the barrier is raised, "You are getting a pension." But these men do not receive the pension the Congress intended them to have when they passed the pension bill. Economic conditions have destroyed the value of that pension, and all we are trying to do by this bill is equalize the pension to living costs.

There is no new principle involved at all. It is simply a straight increase in the amount of the pension, and it is a very small increase at that.

Some question was raised as to whether or not the World War veterans should be included, but that is not the issue before us at the present time. But, so far as that goes, what would be so terrible about taking care of a 65-year-old World War veteran who could not help himself? Today a man at 65 is completely disabled as far as industry is concerned. You do not have to have both legs and both arms

off to be unable to earn a living now. What man 65 years of age is capable of manual labor in competition with men under 45? Of course, you all know that no one hires a man 65 years old today. So if these veterans at 65 are going to be dependent, the question is whether they are going to be dependent upon local charity, upon local communities, or the Federal Government. I tell you that local communities are no longer able to bear the burden of supporting these men. They must be supported; that is, they must be fed. We can no longer support them in our poorhouses or under our local pension systems because the local taxation is raised on property largely, and today property is burdened beyond its capacity to pay. It certainly cannot pay any more. But when the Federal Government gives a pension it gets that money only from those who are able to pay it in the form of income taxes. While we all agree, perhaps, that the burden of the income tax is high, still only those who can pay do pay it. In the local communities the tax on the property is already too great, and if one cannot pay the tax the property is taken to pay the tax.

These veterans did not fight for a city or a State. They fought for all of the people of the United States, and it is, therefore, an obligation of the people of the United States to see that they may live decently in their old age. If you want patriotism in this country, and if you want to raise a generation that is willing to support the country and defend it, we better make this country one that is worthy of such support and defense by showing loyalty to the men who have previously defended the country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who is secretly rather glad that the pensions are costing us until it hurts. I hope it will hurt so much that we will think twice before we go into another war. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman has expressed my sentiments 100 percent. I would like to know how many Spanish War veterans are living today and at what rate they are dying. I understand they are dying at the rate of 17 a day.

Mr. MAAS. I think there has been a slight increase.

Mr. HOUSTON. This cost would be negligible.

Mr. MAAS. The cost would begin to disappear very rapidly.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. May I say that the figures compiled by the United Spanish War Veterans show that 8,200 Spanish War veterans passed away during the year 1936.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not a fact if we pass this bill the next year's increase will be the highest and from that time on it will taper right on down?

Mr. MAAS. That is correct.

Mr. COSTELLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. Is not the big peak the year 1946 in connection with Spanish War veterans? It is my understanding that 1946 will be the peak and from then on there will be a decline.

Mr. MAAS. That is true with reference to general pensions.

Mr. COSTELLO. I mean the total.

Mr. MAAS. The total; yes.

The question has been raised as between the World War veterans and the Spanish War veterans. I may say that I am a World War veteran, and as World War veterans we must recognize a distinction as between the two. We received a bonus. We immediately got splendid hospitalization from the beginning. The Spanish War veterans did not get any of those benefits, and they served under conditions

infinitely worse than the conditions under which the World War veteran served. Our medical service in the World War was vastly superior. We had entirely different sanitary conditions. No one knows to this day the effect on the state of a man's health of his service in the Spanish-American War. They had fever right in our own camps in this country.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Is it not a fact that records show that the death rate during the Spanish-American War was the highest of any war in which the country was engaged?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; the highest of any war in which we participated.

Just to clear the mind of the gentleman from New York that two pensions may not be payable if this act is passed, I want to read from section 4715 of the Revised Statutes, as follows:

Nothing in this title shall be so construed as to allow more than one pension at the same time to the same person, or to persons entitled jointly; but any pensioner who shall so elect may surrender his certificate, and receive, in lieu thereof, a certificate for any other pension to which he would have been entitled had not the surrendered certificate been issued. But all payments previously made for any period covered by the new certificate shall be deducted from the amount allowed by such certificate.

I think there need be no apprehension that if this bill is passed anyone is going to receive a double pension. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with some hesitancy that I rise to make a few remarks on this subject, but having served in the Spanish War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the World War, I feel I am conversant with the situation at least in a slight degree. Some of the men who would obtain pensions under this act have served in all three of the wars mentioned. May I also add that I have not applied for a pension under Spanish War acts nor have I requested any kind of compensation under World War legislation. I have not accepted the Federal or bonus provisions made by the State of Iowa; hence I do not feel that I am disqualified by interest when I state a few pertinent facts.

The question was raised with respect to whether need or amount of income should be shown. When our Government retires officers from our regular military services, the Army and Navy, they are not obliged to show need or that they do not have other income but receive their generous allowances automatically.

May I call the attention of the House to the delayed favors which have been granted to these veterans? It is true we have a Soldiers' Preference Act, but this never was of much avail to the Spanish War veteran because he had attained an age where he was beyond the age of employment in most of the States or by the Federal Government before this privilege was accorded to him. With regard to hospitalization, a general bill was passed in 1926, or almost 30 years after the conclusion of the Spanish War. I personally know of many Spanish War veterans who were seriously ill throughout all that period and who were obliged to pay for their own medical services and hospitalization.

Then, these veterans have never had the opportunity for vocational training, the chance to draw several hundred dollars to assist them in preparing to fight the battles of life; neither were their parents ever allowed any amount because of their dependence upon these veterans. So there is a distinct difference between the total allowance they will ultimately receive and those favors which will be accorded to men who have served in other wars.

It was suggested here that our Government is too generous with veterans. Possibly that is true in some instances. However, only last year, in hearings before one of the committees of this House, it was disclosed we have between 3,000,000 and 5,000,000 aliens illegally here, who are on the relief rolls and being employed by our Government. Therefore, it seems that in this respect at least the Federal Gov-

ernment has had adequate funds to assist aliens, and I do not know that there has been any discontinuance of this practice. Several efforts have been made to stop this policy, but Executive influence has prevented this billion-dollar gratuity to aliens. We have been spending a billion dollars a year to feed or employ persons who are here in violation of our laws. Doubtless a number of them were in the enemy armies only a few years ago, but they are receiving sustenance from our Government.

The question of the age of Spanish War veterans has been raised here. Their average age is 62 years. Approximately two-thirds of these Spanish War veterans are now deceased. Therefore, if this increase should be available to them, the total amount of the payment will shortly decrease because of the age which they have attained, plus the impairments which will, of course, adversely affect their longevity.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THURSTON. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] a moment ago stated that this would be establishing a precedent by fixing the age limit. Under the law we have established, when an Army or Navy officer arrives at a certain age, an age much lower than the one provided here for the Spanish-American War veteran, he automatically receives a pension from the Federal Government, three-fourths of his pay, or several hundred dollars per month. Is it not true that nearly all the pensions provided in the various States and by the Government itself are based on age, the same as we are basing it in this provision; and is it not also true that at 65 years of age the Spanish War veteran is unable to seek employment either from the Government or from individuals anywhere under present conditions?

Mr. THURSTON. The gentleman's reasons are sound and he has amplified the merit for the passage of this measure. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION].

Mr. ROSSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I have listened with keen interest to the speech of our colleague, Mr. COSTELLO, of California, in opposition to the bill before us (H. R. 5030) providing for an increase of pension for certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition. I cannot agree with my colleague [Mr. COSTELLO]. I think this is a meritorious measure, and it affords me a great deal of pleasure to have an opportunity to speak and vote for it.

This measure provides that all soldiers, sailors, and nurses who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition between the dates of April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, shall receive a pension of \$60 per month after such person has attained the age of 65 years—in other words, all soldiers, sailors, and nurses who had 90 days or more service in the military or naval service of the United States between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, and received an honorable discharge would be entitled to \$60 per month after reaching the age of 65 years. Under the present law such persons are entitled to \$72 per month in the event they need the regular aid and attendance of another person. This bill increases their pension from \$72 per month to \$100 per month. Of course, the law providing for \$60 per month for these veterans and nurses who are totally and permanently disabled to perform manual labor, even though they may not be 65 years of age, still stands. This bill does not reduce in any manner pensions granted to persons for disabilities contracted in the service in line of duty.

Those who are opposed to this bill say that it is unnecessary and that the Government cannot afford the money involved, and they also urge that World War veterans may make similar demands. According to the Veterans' Administration, this bill will affect approximately 25,000 per-

sons, and the annual increased cost to the Government over the present law will be \$5,749,000.

The fact has been established that more than 95 percent of these veterans and nurses need the pensions. We know that the Government will not employ any person that is 65 years of age, and no railroad, factory, mill, shop, or mine will employ persons of that age. Few men 65 years of age are capable of performing any substantial amount of manual labor; and if they were able to perform such labor, they cannot secure employment.

Practically all of these veterans have families, and in view of the high cost of living they can barely get by on \$60 per month. These veterans are dying off at the rate of nearly 9,000 annually. Unless we grant relief to these needy veterans, they will be compelled, a lot of them, to go to poorhouses, poor farms, and depend upon local charity.

It has been said that the largest group of men and women volunteered for service in the Spanish-American and Philippine War that volunteered in any war throughout the history of the world. It was a wonderful group of men and women. The death rate was greater in that war than in any other war in which this country has been engaged. They did not volunteer to fight for any particular community—they volunteered in defense of freedom and our country, and the Nation should not now shunt them off into poorhouses and on to poor farms and force them to depend upon community charity. It is not only the obligation of the Nation but this great rich Nation should welcome the opportunity to show its gratitude to these splendid men and women who now average 62 years of age and a great majority of whom are now in declining health.

Some have intimated that we should require a pauper's oath before these pensions could be paid. I first became a member of the Pension Committee of the House in 1919 and helped to report out and pass the act of June 5, 1920, and had charge of the bill for the Spanish War widows and children passed on September 1, 1922, and had charge of the Spanish War bill granting increases to the veterans and their dependents that became a law on May 1, 1926. I was a Member of the Senate when a further increase was granted to the Spanish War veterans in 1930, and voted to override the President's veto. When these measures were up, it was then urged that we should provide for a pauper's oath before anyone could secure the benefits of the legislation. In cooperation with other Members of the House and Senate we were able then to defeat all such proposals, and I am now opposed to any such provision. This aid from the Government for heroic and patriotic service should always remain a badge of honor and not a mark of poverty.

The ranks of this great group of men and women are thinning rapidly, and the small sums that we are providing for them in this bill will not be felt by the American people.

FAVOR RELIEF FOR WORLD WAR VETERANS

It is urged that World War veterans may urge like relief when they have attained the age of 65 years. No doubt 95 percent or more of them will need such relief when they have attained that age, and looking down through the years I can see no greater promise of economic security for them than the Spanish War veterans now have. The Government will not employ them and neither will industry nor commerce.

George Washington in his first message to Congress urged Congress to provide for those who had made our liberties possible. Abraham Lincoln was most solicitous for the defenders of our country and their widows and orphans, and this has been true of all our Presidents, with the exception of President Roosevelt. He has urged that there is no difference between those who went out and offered their lives and defended our country and those who remained at home.

We are told that more than likely the President will veto this bill. He has that authority under the Constitution, but that should not prevent us from doing what we think is right for the veterans and their dependents. I am happy to have an opportunity to vote for this bill, and will vote to override the President's veto in the event he does veto this bill.

It is also urged as an argument against this bill that the bill for the gold-star mothers and for the widows and orphans of World War veterans will be pressed upon Congress for action. I am in favor of that legislation, and it is insisted that the disabled emergency officers' retirement bill will be pressed if we pass this bill. I helped to pass that bill as a Member of the Senate, and I have always opposed the action taken by Congress in the Economy Act and the regulations thereunder taking away the pensions of disabled emergency officers. I trust that we may have an opportunity to vote for these several measures for the relief of World War veterans and their dependents.

BEST INVESTMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

War clouds are gathering throughout the world. The security of our Nation is threatened by forces without as well as forces within. We have many large and disloyal groups in this country. They would seize upon the first opportunity to overthrow our Government. We are now spending annually approximately a billion dollars for national defense, and I would have our country at all times adequately defended. Our country has never lost a war. Ships, guns, and other armaments are important, but the great reason we have never lost a war was because of the men behind the guns and the men who manned the ships. I wish to repeat what I have heretofore said on the floor of this House—the best dollar that this Nation can spend for national defense is to care for and protect those and their dependents who have fought our battles and defended our country. This Nation should never be wanting in gratitude. It will be wanting in gratitude if it stands by and sees its defenders become common beggars and forced to find care and support in poorhouses and on poor farms.

Some of our Democratic friends today are balking at a few million dollars to help the veterans, when we have squandered and wasted billions of dollars on boondoggling enterprises and projects. There was enough money wasted on the boondoggling project of undertaking to harness the tides of the bay of Passamaquoddy to pay the pensions provided in this bill for 3 years or more; and this is only one of the large number of ways in which the taxpayers' money has been squandered and wasted. Under this administration anybody and everybody can get money except the veterans and their widows and orphans.

There is another bill coming up following the bill now before us. It is H. R. 2904. It provides for the payment of travel pay and allowances for subsistence due to those who served in the Philippine Islands. This is a just obligation on the part of the United States Government; it has existed for many years. In the Seventy-fourth Congress we passed a bill to grant this relief and do justice to these veterans and carry out the obligation of the United States Government, but President Roosevelt vetoed the bill. I am happy to have an opportunity to support this measure again; and if it is vetoed, I trust that it will be done while Congress is in session, so that we may have an opportunity to pass it over the President's veto.

Whenever the veterans and their widows and orphans are involved, we hear a lot of talk about economy. The vicious Economy Act that rode roughshod over the disabled veterans of this country and the widows and orphans of veterans was passed by the present administration in the name of economy. They were going to balance the Budget, but the only economy that has been practiced has been at the expense of the defenders of this country and their dependents. Since that time the administration has created a deficit of approximately \$16,000,000,000 and has increased the national debt from \$20,000,000,000 to more than \$36,500,000,000, and only two-thirds of the first month of the new fiscal year has elapsed, but the deficit is nearly \$200,000,000. The expenses are nearly \$100,000,000 more than they were for the first 20 days of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1936.

Congress has appropriated approximately \$16,000,000,000 for so-called recovery and relief. Now, when we propose to

grant relief to approximately 25,000 veterans and nurses, costing annually less than \$6,000,000, there is a great cry of economy. If we are going to economize, let us not start and end as this administration did, by showing the Nation's ingratitude to the old or disabled veterans and their widows and orphans. [Applause.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRISWOLD].

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] was very adept and very adroit in drawing his conclusions and in stating figures which he admits are 15 percent wrong. However, like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], I am not so deeply interested in figuring now what this is going to cost the country. Like that gentleman, I think the time to think of the cost of war is before the war starts, when we gentlemen here in Congress decide that we are going to have a war and that we are going to send a lot of young men to war without their consent. Then is the time to think of the cost, not after we have accepted the service of the soldier and changed his economic status.

The thing to do with respect to this bill is to divest your minds of any connection or confusion with respect to the World War veterans. The gentleman from California tried to inject such comparisons into the debate. The gentleman from California remembered his figures well, but he forgot lots of other things so far as the Spanish-American War veterans and World War veterans are concerned. This is the difference he should have kept in mind: The Spanish-American War veteran, who was a volunteer soldier, served for \$15 a month, while the World War veteran, who was a forced soldier, got \$30 a month and was permitted to allocate \$15 of it back home, which was matched dollar for dollar by the Federal Government, which gave him a total of \$45 a month. The World War veteran was also permitted to take out insurance that would protect him in later life and in some way compensate him and his family for lack of a pension. The Spanish-American War veteran was not given this privilege. The World War veteran, when he left the service, was given a bonus of \$60. The Spanish-American War veteran was not given this bonus. The World War veteran does not get anything that he does not deserve. In many instances he deserves much more than he received. The Spanish War veteran deserves as much.

If you want to draw comparisons, draw some of these comparisons about the difference which one man got for his services in comparison with what the other man got for his.

This bill, according to the report of the committee and, maybe, those figures are 15 percent wrong also, I do not know—but this bill provides for a cost of \$5,000,000, which is less than half the cost of one destroyer, and this Congress, time after time, passes bills not only for one destroyer but for dozens of destroyers and in these same bills they have gone so far as to give \$1,000,000 for the plans, one plan fitting the whole bunch of destroyers and \$1,000,000 being allowed for the plans for each destroyer. If you give money away like this, why should you object to \$5,000,000 to compensate these men? Why should you object to \$40 a month for the Spanish War veteran when you give a citizen of Canada \$5,200 a year as the Northwest director of the A. A. A.? It is preposterous that you should haggle over a thing like this under such a situation. If there be those who think the World War veteran receives too much they have a reason to vote against this bill. I do not think the World War veteran receives too much.

I think this bill by all means should pass this House and that these men should be given now some of the things that you have already given to the World War veterans which the Spanish War veteran did not get. This is an attempt to bring the Spanish War veteran in this particular class up to the same status as the World War veteran. [Applause.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, from the discussion we have just had evidently there are two objections. One is the objection that the bill as drawn might possibly permit two pensions. This I do not believe is true, as evidenced by a reading of the law by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], but in addition to that, we can either adopt the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] or adopt an amendment which I suggest, namely, that at the bottom of page 3 you add this further proviso:

Provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as permitting the drawing of two pensions under this act.

This would easily take care of this objection.

Now, what is the second objection? The second objection is that of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] in regard to the cost. The cost, as I recall from the hearings before the committee, is estimated at \$5,700,000.

A \$5,700,000 cost ought not to be such an amazing hurdle for the gentleman from California to cross, because, as I recall it, the gentleman was in favor of many of the amendments that were offered on the Interior appropriation bill and the cost was many times the \$5,700,000 contained in this bill. So it seems he is willing to deprive these men, who are 65 years of age and 90 to 95 percent of them disabled and unfit for service, of a livelihood. He is willing to take away from the men who are so disabled that they need an attendant \$100 a month, which would provide for their care, but he is perfectly willing that there shall be added reclamation areas where nobody lives at 10 to 15 times the cost of this bill.

So I say there is nothing alarming about the cost, but I might add that I echo the sentiments of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] 100 percent when he states it is a good thing that we do find out what war costs so we will not be so anxious to get into the next one.

I want to supplement this remark with the statement that we have a lot of foreigners who welched on their debts, who are owing us over twelve billion of dollars, and I have not seen the gentleman from California take the floor and rake them over the coals for not paying us even the interest on what they owe us. I would suggest that this Congress pay some attention to what is owed us by these foreign nations that have welched on their debts to us, who pay us nothing on the principal and now refuse to pay us the interest.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. Has the gentleman any plan for collecting that \$12,000,000,000?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I have a plan.

Mr. BIERMANN. I would like to hear it.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not know that I have the time to discuss it, but to begin with, we were given some bonds on that indebtedness, and my suggestion to the Treasurer of the United States is that we sell those bonds in the open market and use the cash, and one of the uses that we could put it to is to pay this pension for the Spanish-American War veterans. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] made a very interesting speech upon this bill, the purpose of which is to provide a pension of \$60 per month for every Spanish-American War veteran who has reached the age of 65 years. The speech showed study and it showed research. Some of the things the gentleman from California said are, of course, true, but in my opinion, if everything the gentleman said is true, and if all the suppositions he indulged in should prove to be correct, and if all of the predictions he made in regard to the matter should be fulfilled, still it is my belief his argument would not be sufficient to prevail against this bill.

This bill should stand on its own merits, and the question involved here is simply whether you think a pension of \$60 a month for a Spanish War veteran who has reached the

age of 65 years is too much. If you think that is not too much, you should vote for this bill.

The gentleman's predictions were interesting, particularly the prediction that in the course of time the World War veteran would be asking for a similar pension.

Let me say in reply to the gentleman that I am not at all sure that what he predicts will not happen. I can conceive even now that it well might happen. And I can also conceive that if it does happen there may be good and sufficient reasons for it. Furthermore, if it does happen, it can and ought to be decided at the time it happens, upon its merits, and its merits alone.

From the time of the Revolutionary War down to the present it has been the policy of this Government that those who offer their bodies as breastworks to the Nation in the time of the Nation's need shall be cared for by the Nation when they reach the age when they cannot take care of themselves. That has always been our policy. My opinion is that it will always continue to be. Only once did the Congress undertake to change that policy. In the hysterical days of 1933, under Presidential domination, the majority of this Congress passed the Economy Act under which all jurisdiction over veterans and veteran legislation was surrendered by the Congress and placed in the hands of the President. You all know what happened under that iniquitous act, which, thank God, has now been entirely repealed.

You know with what ruthlessness the veteran was treated while that law was in effect. You know with what insistence an outraged people demanded its repeal as soon as the people discovered what that law really was. The people then demanded that their Representatives in Congress recapture the authority they had surrendered to the President. And the Congress obeyed that mandate and recaptured that authority.

I am glad that the Congress is again in position to consider veterans' legislation calmly and independently and entirely upon its own responsibility. And that is the way, I believe, that the Congress now intends to consider and to dispose of the bill before us.

As for the cost of veterans' legislation to the taxpayers of this country, the taxpayers always know at the time they enter into a war and at the time they vote for a war what that cost is going to include. They know its cost is not merely for its immediate prosecution; they know that cost is going to last as long as there is a veteran living, and I agree with what was said a moment ago, that it may even be a good thing for the people of this Nation to have some experience now in the high cost of veterans' legislation. An adequate realization of this may be an important factor in keeping us out of another war.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be considered on its own merits. Sixty dollars a month for a Spanish War veteran who has reached the age of 65 years is not, I think, anything more than simple justice and equity. If that is not equity, then what is equity? That is the only question to be decided here. In my opinion this bill, this belated bill, for the benefit of the Spanish War veteran who has arrived at the age of 65 years is long past due, and the legislation ought to be enacted without a dissenting vote. [Applause.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill for the many very cogent reasons already given and for other reasons that I could give myself. It costs a totally disabled Spanish War veteran who requires the aid and attendance of another as much to live as it does a Civil War veteran in the same condition. And in these strenuous days the cost of living is probably higher than it has ever been before. I favor this bill because I believe a totally disabled veteran is entitled to that amount if he cannot care for himself. In these days, when a man of 65 without a competency or a means of livelihood finds himself without a job, he has absolutely no chance to get one. The social-security laws which we have passed take care of those over 65 in practically all the States, but a veteran

drawing a pension is not allowed to profit from that law. I cite this to show that we are showing a more liberal attitude toward all classes over 65, and why not do the same in the case of those who defended the Nation when war was winging its desolation over the world? I shall take the time granted me to discuss more fully the matter that was brought out by my friend from New York [Mr. TABER] and our distinguished minority floor leader [Mr. SNELL], as to whether or not this bill needs to be amended. The colloquies in which these two gentlemen and myself and others engaged raised a question as to whether the language of this bill was sufficient to insure that a veteran seeking a pension under the terms of this bill could not under its terms draw two pensions. At that time I felt that an amendment of the kind which they proposed was not necessary. I have read the bill carefully since then, and I have come to the conclusion that an amendment is not necessary. It strikes me that section 3 takes care of the situation admirably and completely. For instance, section 1 provides that the pensions of one group should be increased. Section 2 provides that the pensions of another group should be increased.

Section 3 provides that any veteran finding himself in either of these two groups mentioned in section 1 or section 2 should then make an application for an increase in pension, as provided in this bill. Applications will be furnished by the Veterans' Bureau and the Bureau will also provide regulations under which such application blanks will be sent out and regulations as to what language these blanks will contain and what the veteran will be required to show and prove in order to get consideration under this bill. In practically every case the new application will be built around the facts set out by the veteran in his papers on file with the Veterans' Bureau. It is a well-established fact that a veteran is not entitled to two pensions. The veterans are not seeking two pensions in this case. I think the amendment spoken of by the distinguished gentleman is not necessary. If it is passed, however, I can see nothing about it that will be harmful. If it is harmful, it can be taken out when the bill gets to the Senate. [Applause.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there are just two points I want to make. The first is a little first-hand experience. When I walked into the Chamber a few moments ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] was discussing the difference between the service and the accommodations to the soldiers in the Spanish-American War and the late World War. I spent 2 years and a half in the Philippine Islands at the time of the Philippine Insurrection. I do not want to be understood as talking for myself, but I do want to say a word for my comrade veterans of the Spanish-American War. How would you like to sit down to a plate of snails? How would you like to banquet on locusts or grasshoppers? How would you like the experience of service in the United States Signal Corps, maintaining an office for 6 months afflicted with chills and fever as a chronic malarial condition, without a doctor or hospital accommodations anywhere, without any medicine, and with no food except what you could "bush-cow" for yourself? How would you enjoy living on green bananas? How would you like to hike in the rain or in the tropical sun for 2 or 3 days on emergency rations?

Those are some of the things that the soldier who served in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection did. He had no canteens. There were no Knights of Columbus tents, no Y. M. C. A., no Salvation Army. There were no cots. He slept in the mud or wherever he could sleep, ate whatever he could eat, and drank whatever he could locate that was wet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY] has expired.

Mr. GASQUE. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. In this great day when our Nation is flooded with all kinds of "isms" and "osophies" and incantations that come from God knows where, you cannot

go into the ranks of the veterans of the Spanish-American War and find that those "isms" will take root in that group of men nor can find lodgment in their ranks. There are no Bolsheviks that I know of in the hearts of loyal, patriotic Spanish-American War veterans. You will not find in all this land, among all our great organizations, any more patriotic men, any more patriotic sentiment than inspires those veterans of that greatest of all volunteer armies. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this bill because I do not subscribe to the doctrine that the mere fact that a young man wore the royal raiment of the Army or the Navy or the Marine Corps in the time of his country's peril entitles him to special monetary benefits from his Government after he comes out of the service unharmed. I hope that during my service in this House I shall never cast a vote to subscribe to that doctrine, which I believe does as much to undermine the morale and the patriotism of certain groups of young people in this country as any other one thing.

The amount of pensions we pay to the real deserving veterans of the recent wars is shamefully low. A widow of a man killed at Chateau-Thierry gets \$30 a month. A man suffering permanent disability, service connected, gets a very small amount—I do not now recall just how much. Those are the people who deserve the financial help to be voted by this Congress. The doctrine that merely because young men in good health and foot-loose put on the uniform of their country at wartime should thereafter be considered an especially privileged group violates all ideas of patriotism and Americanism that are in my heart. I never shall cast a vote to subscribe to that doctrine while I am in this House.

The idea has been expressed that all these men are paupers and decrepit because they are 65 years of age. One of the wealthiest men in my district is a veteran of the Spanish-American War and he is drawing a pension, and within the month he wrote to me to see how he could get it increased. He is a millionaire, who came out unscathed. I know other Spanish War veterans who, though well to do, are drawing pensions.

Let us see about the Spanish-American War. There were engaged in the Spanish-American War, during the less than 4 months it lasted, 280,000 American troops. Thirty-eight years later, on June 30, 1936, there were 228,000 persons, veterans and their widows, drawing pensions on account of the Spanish-American War, which lasted 4 months.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, they drew out of the United States Treasury more than \$108,000,000.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield briefly.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The pension rolls of the Spanish-American War also include veterans of the Philippine Insurrection and the Boxer Rebellion. That increases the number.

Mr. BIERMANN. I think my figures do not include any but Spanish veterans. I got these figures out of the 1937 World Almanac, pages 938 and 939, and my understanding of the figures is that they do not include the Philippine Insurrection or the Boxer Rebellion. The dates of the hostilities as set out on page 939 seem to me to show clearly that only the Spanish War is included.

The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] I think has performed a courageous service here in opposing this bill. I do not like to impute unworthy motives to Members of this body, but when we have been voting on veterans' legislation I have often wondered whether or not the fact that in the average district of the United States there are from eight to ten thousand veterans of various wars and perhaps 25,000 of their intimate relatives of voting age had anything to do with the course of the vote.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BIERMANN. I would like to see House Joint Resolution 442, by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO], adopted by this body and the other body, so that the entire pension system of the United States may be investigated and remodeled and put on a basis of justice.

I would like to wipe out the shame of a widow of a service-connected veteran of the World War getting only \$30 a month. I would like to see these men who really have service-connected disability much more generously treated. I would like to see stricken off the pension rolls of this country every veteran of any war who came out of it unscathed and who is not now suffering from his service in the Army. No other country in the wide world subscribes to our doctrine regarding pensions.

A few years ago our pension system had become so inflated that to the World War veterans and their dependents we were paying more benefits than Great Britain, France, and Germany combined, although their casualties were something like 42 times as many as ours. I hope that sometime we can have a calm discussion and an equitable revision of our pension laws. I would like to have a secret ballot, if that were possible under the rules of this body, to remodel our pension system, giving generous treatment to those suffering disabilities and to the dependents of those who died of service-connected disabilities.

The Economy Act was mentioned. I voted for the Economy Act and would vote for it again in the same circumstances. I think one of the mistakes we made was when we got away from the Economy Act. The Economy Act struck off the pension rolls of the country more than 400,000 former soldiers who were drawing pensions for disabilities that had no connection, not even a theoretical connection, with their service in the Army. I am glad to see that that one feature of the Economy Act still prevails.

Mr. MOTT. It also cut down pensions of Civil War veterans to \$15 a month, did it not?

Mr. BIERMANN. It also provided that the President could change the rules regarding those pensions so that deserving ones could get more pensions after the Economy Act than before.

Mr. MOTT. It also cut down some service-connected, disabled war veterans so that they got only \$10 a month.

Mr. BIERMANN. I do not believe that the record shows that. I believe the record shows that most of the deserving ones got more after the Economy Act than they got before.

Mr. MOTT. The act authorized the President to cut them down to \$7 a month if he wanted to, and in many cases he went very near the limit.

Mr. BIERMANN. I do not think the record will show that any injustice was done to any service-connected case.

Some time ago a World War overseas veteran of Des Moines, Iowa, writing of another general gratuity, offered to veterans without regard to service, disability, or need, said:

If I accept this "political bribe", I must forever renounce my title as a true veteran and a patriot. * * * When the love for money becomes greater than the love for country, veterans who returned in perfect health may well conceal their identity for they are no longer patriots.

But the blame for our unjust, demoralizing pension system is not so much on the rank and file of the veterans as it is on two other groups. One of them is some of the men in prominent or high-salaried places in veterans' organizations who seem to believe that they must continually ask for more and more for their constituents. As the disabled and the deserving are a very small minority, they ask for money for the multitude who are not deserving.

The other group are politicians, who during many years of our history have used pensions practically as campaign funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this bill will pass the House without a dissenting vote. I realize that I may not change a vote. You are familiar with the bill. It has been thoroughly discussed; but I rise

to show my appreciation for the service of those men who served during the Spanish War period, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition. I know we cannot measure service to the country in economics, we cannot measure it in dollars and cents. I realize that when we pay pensions we have to raise the money; but I realize likewise that the sentiment that causes men to give their service to their country should inspire in the breasts of others a sentiment of appreciation for that service, and that appreciation should certainly be expressed by the Government of the country and the people of the country when the men who served are in need. When I say in need I do not mean to say that they should have to prove or make any showing of such necessity. When a man reaches the age set forth in this bill, 65, he may face a dire need for funds; but even if he does not, the funds can be used in his living, in his pleasures, for his benefit, for his family or his loved ones, for adding a little more happiness in the eventide of life.

I am opposed to a "needs" clause being written into this bill. I understand that such an amendment may be offered today, but I hope that it will be voted down because when a veteran secures a pension it should be as a gratuity from a grateful Government and should be a badge of honorable service rather than an evidence of pauperism. I will oppose a needs clause; I will oppose a pauper's oath, but I am glad to support a recognition of valiant service and would be even glad to support this bill with the age limit reduced. Service connection has been hard for many Spanish War veterans to prove. Records were badly kept and lost. Incipient fever, exposure, putrid food took their toll later on. One of my earliest recollections was seeing the soldiers in the camps and hospitals. Sentiment has always made me want to assist them and their widows, and actual experience in handling hundreds of veterans' cases has caused that desire to become practical and set in my mind and heart. I hope that this bill passes, and I hope the bill reported out by the Committee on War Claims, H. R. 2904, may also pass. A rather long belated debt due for travel pay to certain participants in the War with Spain, I understand, may follow this bill. I think, frankly, that the committee has done a good deed in bringing this bill before the House. I am glad to raise my voice in behalf of this measure. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition between the dates of April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902, both dates inclusive, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty, upon reaching the age of 65 years shall, upon making proof of such fact, be placed upon the pension roll and entitled to receive a pension of \$60 a month: *Provided*, That all leaves of absence and furloughs under General Orders, No. 130, August 29, 1898, War Department, shall be included in determining the period of pensionable service: *Provided further*, That the provisions, limitations, and benefits of this section be, and hereby are, extended to and shall include any woman who served honorably as a nurse, chief nurse, or superintendent of the Nurse Corps under contract for 90 days or more between April 21, 1898, and February 2, 1901, inclusive, and to any such nurse, regardless of length of service, who was released from service before the expiration of the 90 days because of disability contracted by her while in the service in line of duty.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 2, line 15, after the word "duty", change the period to a colon and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That no pension shall be paid under this act to any person who paid an income tax during the previous year."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I referred when I was speaking previously on the bill. It provides that no person shall be entitled to receive a pension under the terms of this act who would be eligible for a pension, if during the previous year he had found it necessary because of his income to pay an income tax; in other

words, if he is actually receiving such an income as to warrant payment of a tax to the Government, then he would be denied the benefits of this legislation in the way of a pension.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Would this affect the right of veterans who pay income taxes who receive their pension compensation under existing law?

Mr. COSTELLO. No; the language is "that no person who is entitled to receive a pension under this act." This would refer exclusively to this particular act and to nothing else.

Mr. MOTT. Then if a veteran over 65 years of age, who is now drawing \$40 or \$50 a month, for example, pays an income tax after this act is passed, he would not be denied the privilege of drawing the \$40 or \$50 under the present law?

Mr. COSTELLO. If in the year 1936 the veteran paid an income tax, regardless of the amount, then in 1937 he would not be entitled to receive a pension under this act. If he did not pay an income tax in 1937, then he would be entitled in 1938 to again receive the benefits of the act.

If a person has been receiving such an income as to make it necessary to pay a tax thereon, he should not be receiving a pension from the Government; and that is the purpose in offering the amendment. In other words, as the act is now written a Member of Congress who happened to be 65 years of age and a Spanish War veteran would be entitled to receive \$60 a month. Under the terms of the amendment, since he would pay an income tax, he would be stopped from receiving the pension. Otherwise there is no restriction whatsoever.

Mr. MOTT. Would it prevent him from receiving any Spanish War veteran pension at all?

Mr. COSTELLO. No. The wording is such as to limit it to this act exclusively.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOWELL. Under this act when they arrive at a certain age they come within its provisions. If this sort of an amendment is placed in the bill, will you not cut off every Spanish-American War veteran who pays an income tax, whether his income tax is \$1 or \$2? I am opposed to this amendment. I think they ought to be treated alike and every one ought to have the benefits under this bill who are entitled to them.

Mr. COSTELLO. Frankly, I do not believe general legislation granting pensions should be enacted for persons who may be receiving an adequate income and who may not be in need. I do not think such persons enjoying a taxable income should receive \$60 a month as a pension in addition. In order to try to make it necessary that this pension be paid only to those in need I offer the amendment, which will prevent those who are paying an income tax from receiving the pension. I do not believe they are entitled to receive it.

Mr. WITHROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman spoke of paying any income tax. What does the gentleman mean by "income tax"?

Mr. COSTELLO. I mean a Federal income tax.

Mr. WITHROW. I think the gentleman should make that clear in his amendment. As I read the amendment, it would apply just as well to a State income tax.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert the word "Federal" in front of the words "income tax."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. I do not desire to discuss the merits of the amendment but want to call attention to the fact that under a decision of the Supreme Court rendered in March of this year, it was held that a State, city, or county official or employee of a State, city, or county was not required to pay

a Federal income tax on his or her salary. If the gentleman's suggestion is followed with reference to amending this amendment, then he eliminates every State official and every State employee as well as officials and employees of cities and counties. I do not believe the gentleman wants to do that. We are trying to correct that situation, caused by the Court's decision.

I have introduced a resolution providing for a constitutional amendment which will make everybody receiving sufficient income pay not only a State but a Federal income tax. Now, if the suggestion advanced prevails, you eliminate those not employed by a State or subdivision thereof but permit the employee on the public pay roll to receive the benefits of this bill. Surely you do not want such discrimination. Therefore, I object to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I appeal to the Members of the House to vote down the amendment just offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]. The amendment would single out the Spanish War veterans as a group of veterans from all other groups of war veterans and discriminate against them as a group and a class, because they may chance to be paying a small income tax, the same as other citizens. There is now no legislation of similar nature applying to veterans of the World War, the Civil War, the Indian wars, or any other war in which our country has ever engaged. There certainly is no reason why the veterans of the great volunteer army of the Spanish-American War should be discriminated against. On the contrary, they should be treated at least as well as any other group of war veterans in this country, and all war veterans are deserving of just treatment.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] offered an amendment that is based upon the individual veteran paying an income tax. The State of California has community-property laws, and the veterans of that State would have a tremendous advantage over the veterans of all the other States of the Union which do not have community-property laws, because the income could be twice as much in California and still not subject the veteran to the payment of an income tax.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman may be correct, and that is all the more reason why there should be no such discrimination as is contemplated by the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Economy Act of 1933 contained a somewhat similar provision—a needs clause—relating to the Spanish War veterans; and every Member of this House will bear me out when I say that after that law went into effect the veterans of the Spanish-American War were subjected to investigation of their individual cases.

They were harassed; they were annoyed; they were persecuted. I know of my own personal knowledge of scores of cases in which it was impossible to secure any measure of justice for a veteran of the Spanish-American War on account of the so-called needs clause which was provided by the Economy Act. The result was that 2 years ago, in 1935, when this House and Congress enacted my bill repealing the Economy Act as it applied to the Spanish-American War veterans and restored in full their pensions, it struck out the so-called needs clause, and the Congress placed the veterans of the Spanish-American War on the same basis as the veterans of all other wars. I submit to the House we should do the same thing here today. There is absolutely no reason why the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] should be adopted, and I hope the Members of the House will vote it down. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIERMANN: Page 1, line 7, after the second comma, insert "or the World War."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BIERMANN) there were—ayes 4, noes 15.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Any soldier, sailor, or marine, or nurse with service as defined in section 1 of this act now on the pension roll or who may be hereafter entitled to a pension under existing laws, or under this act on account of his service during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or China Relief Expedition, who is now or hereafter may become, on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, shall be given a rate of \$100 a month.

SEC. 3. That the pension or increased rate of pension herein provided for shall commence from the date of filing application therefor after the approval of this act in such form as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, provided they are entitled to a pension under the provisions of this act, and the issue of a check in payment of a pension for which the execution and submission of a voucher was not required shall constitute payment in the event of the death of the pensioner on or after the last day of the period covered by such check, and it shall not be canceled, but shall become an asset of the estate of the deceased pensioner.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be held to affect or diminish the additional pension to those on the roll designated as the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll, as provided by the act of April 27, 1916, but any pension or increase of pension herein provided for shall be in addition thereto: *Provided*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State Soldiers' Home shall be paid more than \$50 per month under this act.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 3, line 21, after the word "act", strike out the period and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That any pension paid to any person under the provisions of this act shall be in lieu of any other pension to which he might be entitled under any other war-service pension act."

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which the committee has accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 3, line 20, after the word "Home", insert the following: "and while the Government of the United States contributes toward defraying the expense incurred in providing such inmates with domiciliary care."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I believe the chairman of the Committee on Pensions is willing to accept this amendment, which merely provides against discrimination in the States where we have State homes which care for veterans.

This provision in the bill now reads as follows:

Provided, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any other National or State soldiers' home shall be paid more than \$50 per month under this act.

This provision calls for a reduction of \$10 per month even though the person be in a State soldiers' home. Only five or six States in the Union have State homes, some of which have requirements as severe as the Federal laws. In the State of Wisconsin, however, we have very liberal laws providing for domiciliary care for veterans of all wars. We have the Wisconsin veterans' home at Waupaca, Wis., which cares not only for veterans of the World War but for their wives. This is a beautiful home, with cottages where a man and wife can live together. It is a splendid home, and is maintained by the State government.

It is true that veterans in the home who would be otherwise entitled to domiciliary care in a national home receive \$10 a month from the Federal Government, but we have many veterans in our State institution in Waupaca, Wis.,

who would not be eligible for domiciliary care in a national home. Some of these men would receive compensation in the amount of \$60 a month if they were on the outside, but their compensation is reduced \$10 a month by the Federal Government even though the Federal Government does not contribute anything, not one cent, to their domiciliary care. I maintain that this is a discrimination against the States which are liberal to these veterans.

My amendment would provide for a reduction in the pension from \$60 to \$50, provided the Federal Government was contributing anything whatsoever toward the domiciliary care, so that all the veterans in State homes who would otherwise be eligible to care in a national home would, under the provisions of my amendment, have their compensation reduced \$10 a month only, provided the Federal Government made that contribution to the States, as it does in all cases where the veteran is entitled to domiciliary care.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. How would the gentleman's amendment affect the case of a helpless veteran in a Government hospital?

Mr. BOILEAU. It would not affect him at all. He would still get \$50 a month. The bill now provides he shall get only \$50 a month while he is in a national home. My amendment would not change this at all.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. How would the gentleman's amendment affect a man who gets only \$30 a month?

Mr. BOILEAU. It would not affect him at all. Under this amendment, if a man were in a State home, they would take \$10 off his compensation, although the Federal Government did not contribute one cent toward his maintenance. If anyone should get that \$10 it should be the State. In some cases the Federal Government does contribute toward the domiciliary care of veterans in State homes, and in such cases the veteran would receive only \$50, not \$60, so there is no discrimination.

The chairman of the Committee on Pensions has accepted this amendment. I hope it will meet with the approval of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed to diminish or reduce any pension heretofore granted.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WOODRUM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5030) granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 117]

Amle	Fish	Kleberg	Rayburn
Anderson, Mo.	Fitzpatrick	Kloeb	Reed, N. Y.
Bernard	Fleger	Lambeth	Rich
Binderup	Forand	Lamneck	Ryan
Bland	Fries, Ill.	Lea	Sabath
Boykin	Fuller	Lemke	Schuetz
Brewster	Fulmer	Lewis, Md.	Short
Buckley, N. Y.	Gifford	McClellan	Sirovich
Caldwell	Gilchrist	McKeogh	Smith, Va.
Cannon, Wis.	Gray, Ind.	McMillan	Smith, W. Va.
Casey, Mass.	Greenwood	Mason	Somers, N. Y.
Chandler	Haines	Meeks	Starnes
Clark, N. C.	Harlan	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sullivan
Cole, Md.	Harrington	Mosler, Ohio	Sweeney
Cravens	Hennings	Mouton	Swope
Crosby	Higgins	Nichols	Taylor, Colo.
Crosser	Hill, Ala.	Norton	Taylor, S. C.
Crowther	Hoffman	O'Connell, Mont.	Teigan
Culkin	Holmes	O'Malley	Terry
Ditter	Imhoff	O'Neal, Ky.	Thomas, N. J.
Driver	Johnson, Lyndon	Owen	Walter
Duncan	Kee	Parsons	Wene
Eaton	Keller	Patton	West
Edmiston	Kelly, N. Y.	Peyser	
Ellenbogen	Kennedy, Md.	Pfeifer	
Fernandez	Kirwan	Plumley	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-eight Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. COSTELLO, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2193) to authorize the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy.

GUGLIELMO MARCONI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a House resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 283

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has heard with profound regret of the death at his home in Rome, Italy, of Guglielmo Marconi, one of the world's greatest scientists, and one who contributed inestimably to the progress and happiness of mankind.

Resolved, That the House of Representatives join with the peoples of the entire civilized world in paying tribute to the memory of this great man, whose influence was felt and whose passing will be mourned in every corner of the globe.

Resolved, That the Clerk transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the illness of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. MOSIER, who is confined to his home, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be excused from attendance on sessions of the House until his condition will permit him to return.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—ROY V. JENKS (H. DOC. NO. 305)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered printed:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 21, 1937.

The SPEAKER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to lay before the House of Representatives the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the

Seventy-fifth Congress of the United States for the First Congressional District of the State of New Hampshire, *Alphonse Roy v. Arthur B. Jenks*, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto.

In compliance with the act approved March 2, 1887, entitled "An act relating to contested-election cases", the Clerk has opened and printed the testimony in the above case, and such portions of the testimony as the parties in interest agreed upon or as seemed proper to the Clerk, after giving the requisite notices, have been printed and indexed, together with the notices of contest, and the answers thereto and original papers and exhibits have been sealed up and are ready to be laid before the Committee on Elections.

Two copies of the printed testimony in the aforesaid case have been mailed to the contestant and the same number to the contestee, which, together with the briefs of the parties, will be laid before the Committee on Elections to which the case shall be referred.

Yours respectfully,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill (H. R. 5030) considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks made this afternoon and to include therein a table of figures prepared by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

OFFICERS AND SOLDIERS WHO SERVED IN PHILIPPINE ISLANDS BEYOND PERIOD OF ENLISTMENT

The Clerk called the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on War Claims I call up the bill (H. R. 2904) for the relief of officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service in the War with Spain and who were held in service in the Philippine Islands after the ratification of the treaty of peace, April 11, 1899.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers and soldiers of the volunteer service of the United States mustered into service for the War with Spain who were held to service in the Philippine Islands for service in the Philippine Insurrection after April 11, 1899, and after the conclusion of peace with the Kingdom of Spain, shall be entitled to the travel pay and allowance for subsistence provided in sections 1289 and 1290, Revised Statutes, as then amended and in effect, as though discharged April 11, 1899, by reason of expiration of enlistment, and appointed or reenlisted April 12, 1899, without deduction of travel pay and subsistence paid such officers or soldiers on final muster out subsequent to April 11, 1899.

Sec. 2. Claims hereunder shall be settled in the General Accounting Office, and shall be payable to the officer or soldier, or if the person who rendered the service is dead, then to his widow, children, in equal shares (but not to their issue), father, or mother as provided by existing acts relating to the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and soldiers of the Army (34 Stat. 750), but if there is no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then no payment on account of the claim shall be made.

Sec. 3. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to certify to the Congress, pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 266), all claims allowed hereunder.

Sec. 4. Application for the benefits of this act shall be filed within 3 years after the date of its passage.

Sec. 5. Payment to any attorney or agent for such assistance as may be required in the preparation and execution of the necessary papers in any application under this act shall not exceed the sum of \$10; any person collecting or attempting to collect a greater amount than is herein allowed shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. DORSEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. This bill seeks to correct an injustice that was done those volunteers who enlisted for the War with Spain and served in the Philippine Islands. A bill similar to this has passed the House before and has passed the Senate on two occasions. When these men enlisted it was under the act of April 22, 1898 (30 Stat. 361), which reads in part as follows:

That the Volunteer Army shall be maintained only during the existence of the war or while war is imminent: * * * *Provided*, That all enlistments for the Volunteer Army shall be for a term of 2 years, unless sooner terminated, and that all officers and men composing said Army shall be discharged from the service of the United States when the purposes for which they were called into service shall have been accomplished or on the conclusion of hostilities.

The Congress sensed it would be necessary to keep a police force in the Philippine Islands after the termination of the War with Spain, and in March 1899 a law was passed granting the President authority to have these volunteers reenlisted for that purpose. When it was apparent there were going to be hostilities through the action of the insurrectionists in the islands, The Adjutant General of the Army communicated with General Otis, in charge of troops in the Philippines, asking if these men who were in the volunteer service and whose enlistment ceased with the conclusion of the War with Spain would volunteer to stay in the islands until sufficient regulars could be sent there to relieve them. This message was given to these men and in some cases the units that were together had an opportunity to vote upon it, while in other cases, where the men were scattered, the officers spoke for them. They agreed to reenlist for the required period. At that time these men were promised by the officers under General Otis that if they reenlisted or would volunteer for further service they would be given the allowance of travel pay and subsistence either in kind or cash as provided by existing law.

At the conclusion of their enlistment they were entitled to such allowances. Some of these men under their legal rights demanded their discharge. They were discharged and they received those allowances in cash, and then shortly thereafter reenlisted, not only getting travel allowances then but also receiving transportation and allowances in kind after the close of hostilities. But the great body of the volunteers, seeing the necessity of having a force in the Philippines until they could be relieved by regulars, with the insurrectionists in the very trenches they had built, with better arms and better ammunition, volunteered to stay there. Unfortunately this group of men were not mustered out and then again mustered in, because they were scattered through the islands. Technically they did not reenlist, but actually they did, and it is on that technicality that this claim has never been paid. These men served there under the most trying conditions, under the intense heat of a tropical sun, with poor clothing, bad food, and poor equipment, but their loyalty and patriotism to this country stood them in good stead at that time. Through their service, because it would have been impossible to send regulars there to replace them in a short time, they saved this country from perhaps a long-drawn-out struggle and considerably more expense than this bill involves, and put down the insurrection. If there has ever been a moral obligation on the part of this Government, it is due these men and it is long past due, because of a very direct promise that was made at the time they volunteered to serve until they could be relieved.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. I had introduced a bill, H. R. 4704, which

is similar to this one. I believe if we are interested in the welfare of any definite legislation, we should be glad to withdraw our bills and permit similar bills to take their place if it is to accomplish the same purpose. When I had the honor to serve in this House at a former time, I was deeply interested in my comrades of the Spanish War. I went into their records, and I think my colleagues would be interested to know that I found that those men who served in the Spanish War in 1898 comprised the largest volunteer army in the history of civilization, and I think all America would be interested to know that per man enlisted there were more casualties in the War with Spain than in any other war in which America participated.

The tragedy is that because of the small number involved in the Spanish-American War these soldiers have never been able to get just recognition for their services. I find that practically all of the pensions of the past have been based on the number of those who receive it. In other words, the great number of my comrades in the World War made it possible for their maximum pension to be \$100 per month. Then I find that the Civil War veterans, with a lesser number involved, had a \$62.50-per-month maximum. Then the Spanish-American War veterans, with a still smaller number, had up until recently only a \$30-per-month maximum.

I am sure your fair-mindedness would lead you to believe that no pension should be based upon the number of those who receive it. If our Government has an obligation, it has an obligation to one man as well as to three or four million, who can exert more pressure. So I say in behalf of those men who did serve under the tropical heat of Cuba and suffered many privations in the Philippines, and, in fact, many of them have suffered throughout their lives as a result of their services, should recover this belated recognition.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield gladly.

Mr. LUCAS. How many men are involved if this becomes law?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I do not know. They struck out one provision relative to dependents, and I really do not know how many that will affect. My bill involved about 8,000 men. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER] may be able to tell you the exact number.

Mr. BEITER. The average pay is about \$400 and the total number of men involved is about 8,000.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel as an ex-service man of the World War that I must not only aid my own comrades but also our comrades of the Spanish War who have been so long neglected and who are now advanced in years. I anxiously await an opportunity to vote for this bill.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

This is a claim due officers and enlisted men in the volunteer service of the War with Spain who served in the Philippines beyond the period of their enlistment. It calls for the payment to these men of travel-pay allowance which they did not get at the time because of a technicality. The men who were mustered out were given their travel pay, then turned around and immediately reenlisted without leaving the islands. The men whose claims are included in this bill were not mustered out at the end of the War with Spain, but at the request of their superior officers remained on the scene to be ready and available during the expected rebellion in the Philippines. They were later sent home, it is true, but they did not receive the extra travel pay which the men who were earlier mustered out and later reenlisted received. Because the technicality of mustering them out one minute and swearing them in the next was overlooked or neglected, these men have been deprived of their travel pay which so many of their fellow comrades received.

The men that received their travel pay made up the Regular Army. The men that did not get this allowance made up the volunteers. It is true that a volunteer army of these United States is mustered into service to be maintained only during the existence of a war, but the law provides also that

they shall be maintained while war is imminent. The volunteers provided for in this bill remained in the Philippines while war was imminent or, if not war, a rebellion. They should receive the same benefits as the men in the Regular Army received.

Mr. Speaker, I think the attitude of the veterans can best be expressed in their own words. I have here a clipping from the National Tribune, a veterans' publication published in Washington, in which one veteran states:

After a contract has been drawn up and signed, for one party to change the terms of the contract without the knowledge or the consent of the other party constitutes fraud a private citizen could not get away with, but that is exactly what the Government did to many of the men who served in the Philippines.

I volunteered and fought for my country, but in a Regular regiment, as all the volunteer outfits in Greater New York were filled up, and I, being too young, could not get in, so on February 7, 1899, I enlisted in the Ninth United States Infantry, served in the Philippines, in the Boxer Rebellion, then returned again to the Philippines and reenlisted.

I signed a contract which stated I was to receive a day's pay and a day's subsistence for every 20 miles of travel from place of discharge to place of enlistment. I should have been discharged in Manila, but was sent back to Angel Island, Calif., discharged, and paid off at the rate of 4 cents a mile to New York City. That was on March 21, 1902, and so I served in foreign service 3 years, 1 month, and 15 days. I think that all survivors of this particular group should come forward and find out what can be done.

Mr. Speaker, some reference has been made to the President's veto message. The veto message contained objections to the attorneys' fees in the bill which we passed last year and which was approved by the Senate. It objected to a provision that the heirs of the veterans would be eligible to receive this compensation. However, that has been corrected in this new bill, and the compensation will only go to the immediate survivor or his widow or his sons and daughters. It does not go to their heirs. This reduces the number of beneficiaries under this legislation and makes the number approximately 8,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true that if these veterans had not remained in the islands and performed their duty it would have cost the Government very much more, and much that had been gained by their services would have been lost to the Government?

Mr. BEITER. Yes. Probably 10 times as much.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no question about it. It seems to me this has already been too long delayed, and it ought to be passed by a unanimous vote today.

Mr. BEITER. It is a moral obligation on the part of the Government and should be paid.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the total amount involved?

Mr. BEITER. The exact figure cannot be determined until we determine the exact number of men who will benefit by it; but it is estimated that 8,000 men will benefit by it, and the average amount to go to each man will be approximately \$400.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Has the gentleman any assurance that the President will not veto it as he did before?

Mr. BEITER. I have no assurance, but the objections that were expressed in the veto message of last year have been corrected in the new bill.

Mr. DOWELL. Should we not perform our duty anyway and pass the bill?

Mr. BEITER. Yes.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that all the facts involved were contained in the War Department records to which the gentleman has access?

Mr. BEITER. Yes.

Mr. McSWEENEY. So you are taking your factual material from the War Department?

Mr. BEITER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is this not the same bill that we passed 2 years ago?

Mr. BEITER. This is the same bill that we passed last year and was pocket-vetoed by the President. The objectionable features of the bill have been corrected in this new bill.

Mr. HOUSTON. Under the provisions of the other bill, as I recollect them, 15,000 persons would have benefited. I understood the gentleman to say that under this bill 8,000 people would benefit.

Mr. BEITER. That is because we have eliminated the heirs of the veterans as beneficiaries.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Has the Committee on War Claims any other bill?

Mr. BEITER. We have no other bill today.

The Clerk resumed the call of the committees.

ARCH HURLEY CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

Mr. WHITE of Idaho (when the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation was called). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I call up the bill (H. R. 7680) to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole? Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] to explain the bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this bill is to authorize the Reclamation Service to set up a Federal irrigation district in the State of New Mexico. The bill has the unanimous consent of the committee and the recommendation of the Department. Under its terms not one cent of money will be expended from the Federal Treasury. The Reclamation Service will take certain of its funds, which are to be repaid by this district, to carry out such work as is authorized.

The reason we are asking for the establishment of this district is that we are attempting to raise some feed for cattle in that district, because in the past we have been forced to send cattle to Old Mexico at certain times during drought. It is not the intention at all to put under cultivation lands with crops that will be competitive.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money will come from the reclamation fund?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It depends upon the number of acres. I think it is intended to bring in 30,000 acres. The money will come from the reclamation fund, but I point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts that from the State of New Mexico certain oil moneys flow into the reclamation fund. We are simply asking permission to borrow a portion of that by mortgaging our lands to the Reclamation Service as provided by law to establish this district and for the construction of ditching, and so forth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this bill come from the committee with a unanimous report?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It does.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Idaho.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7680) to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico, with Mr. PETTENGILL in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 7680, provides for the construction of a reclamation district in Quay County, N. Mex. This county is situated in the Dust Bowl. We suffer there from dust very similarly to the way people along the Ohio and Mississippi at times suffer from flood, the only difference being that we suffer more frequently. This is a cattle country, one of the greatest cattle-grazing countries we have, at times. During drought years it has been necessary to send as many as 40,000 head of our cattle into Old Mexico for grazing purposes because we did not have sufficient means to irrigate the land.

This bill has the unanimous support of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How many acres are involved?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think about 30,000.

Mr. TABER. Is it now under cultivation?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is a grazing section, but due to the drought and due to the fact that it is in this Dust Bowl area we at times are not able to graze our cattle there because the grass will not grow without water. We have impounded water, and if we can construct some irrigation ditches, we can then irrigate this land for alfalfa growing and thus feed these cattle, which otherwise we would have to send to Old Mexico.

We are not asking a cent from the Federal Government. We are asking that the Irrigation and Reclamation Service provide the money when and if they can, and if they can, we will pay back every dollar of it.

Mr. TABER. Is there anything in this bill that says it shall be paid out of the reclamation fund?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. There is?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Where?

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman will read the report, he will find this bill was drawn at the instance of the Reclamation Service. Here is a letter addressed to CARL HATCH, Senator from New Mexico:

I have received your letter of May 28, with your amended draft of S. 2086 for the construction of a Federal reclamation project to irrigate the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico.

If the bill is to be enacted, it would seem (1) that the title should be amended so as to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico", and (2) that lines 3 to 6, on page 1 of the bill, should be amended so as to read as follows: "That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a Federal reclamation project for the irrigation of the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico under the Federal."

The bill, if enacted, as now revised, would authorize the use of the reclamation fund for the construction of the project, and therefore the project will not increase the expenditures from the general funds in the Treasury, as was first proposed.

The letter states further:

The Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget advises that the proposed bill as now amended would not be in conflict with the financial program of the President, and its enactment is recommended.

The bill before us contains provisions recommended by the Interior Department; so that it has the approval of all the departments to which it has been submitted, and, in addition, it has the approval of the members of the Irrigation Committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. TABER. There is absolutely nothing in the bill that indicates the construction shall be paid out of the reclamation fund that I can see. Maybe I have not had an opportunity to study it sufficiently, but if the gentleman will point it out, I will appreciate it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is nothing in this bill that calls for an appropriation from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; it would call for an appropriation from the Treasury unless it is limited to the reclamation fund.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the gentleman feels this bill should be further amended to safeguard his thought in that respect, I am agreeable to accepting such amendment. As a matter of fact, the fund that goes into the Reclamation Service comes in large part from the State of New Mexico. The Federal Government owns a considerable percentage of the land in New Mexico.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. There has not been any objection made by any department to this bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No.

Mr. HOUSTON. The Interior Department approves it?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. GREEVER. Is it not true that the dam for the impounding of the waters for this land has already been constructed?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. We simply want to construct now some irrigation ditches. Let me point out to you what is happening in our State at the present time. The oil land is owned by the Federal Government. It is true the surface is owned by some poor homesteaders, but the mineral rights are retained by the Federal Government. Certain of this money came to the irrigation fund for this particular service. We have turned into the fund this year \$313,000 from the State of New Mexico. A similar sum has been turned over to the Federal Treasury for whatever purpose the Treasury may eventually use it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us how much money is in the reclamation fund at the present time?

Mr. DEMPSEY. There will be about \$11,000,000 this year.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Is not the question of the gentleman from New York answered in lines 3 to 6, page 1, of the bill, which reads as follows?—

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a Federal reclamation project for the irrigation of the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico under the Federal reclamation laws.

That means the money comes out of the Federal reclamation fund?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Absolutely. It could not come from any place else.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Further referring to the question of the gentleman from New York, it is answered on page 2 of the report of the Acting Secretary, reading as follows:

The bill, if enacted as now revised, would authorize the use of the reclamation fund for the construction of projects, and therefore the project will not increase the expenditures from the general funds in the Treasury, as was first proposed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. I want to inquire about this particular clause which has to do with the contract to be made with each owner of more than 160 irrigable acres. Has that always been customary with irrigation projects?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is customary with reclamation projects. In setting up a reclamation project the idea is to take care of as many people as possible, not just a few people. In other words, we do not take care of the large landowner, but rather those who own not to exceed 160 acres.

Mr. THOM. Is that done universally?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Is it not a fact this comes under the so-called Conchas Dam that is now practically completed, or soon will be? This was a flood-control project and the water should be put to some use?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Especially inasmuch as it does not cost the Federal Treasury any money.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. This would put the water that is stored in the reservoir of the Conchas Dam to use?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes. We feel it desirable and good business to use the water, especially when it does not cost the Treasury of the United States one dime.

May I say in regard to agriculture in our State that we raise less than 15 percent of what we consume in the State of New Mexico. We in the Rocky Mountain States are coming to the time when the only agriculture will be that raised under irrigation, because that is the only agriculture that can be depended upon year by year.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. How much would this proposition cost?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I imagine it would cost about \$80 per acre.

Mr. TABER. It would cost a couple of million dollars?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; I would say about that.

Mr. TABER. The land is not now under cultivation at all?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is not under cultivation except for grazing, and it will be under cultivation only to raise food-stuffs for the cattle, alfalfa and agricultural products of that kind which we cannot ship in.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman on the other side yield some time?

Mr. GEARHART. I have no requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anybody in opposition desire time?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TABER. The whole trouble with this bill is—

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. TABER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I would like to know how much time the gentleman yielded himself.

Mr. TABER. I do not have to yield myself any particular amount of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour and can use as much of that time as he may desire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the whole trouble with this bill is that we are at the present time being cautioned and being asked by the Department of Agriculture to curtail the production of agricultural products. Of course, this includes cattle as well as everything else included in that term, and it did include cattle when they had that kind of a bill up before. How anyone can justify going ahead at a time when the Department of Agriculture is asking for that kind of authority again and can justify the expenditure of a

dollar for bringing under cultivation land which is not now under cultivation is beyond me. I do not believe there is anything else to the case. It is simply a case of putting a lot more land under cultivation and spending a lot of money through the Secretary of Agriculture to stop the raising of crops at other places.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the water which is to be utilized on this irrigation district is all ready to be stored as a flood-control project; and that if we do not utilize the water it will escape to the sea, after all the expense of impounding and restoring the water to the land has been incurred?

Mr. TABER. What of it? Why should we go ahead and spend \$2,000,000 more to put additional land under cultivation when the Secretary of Agriculture tells us we do not need it?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is it the idea of the gentleman that after going to the expense of storing this water and making it available we should let it escape to the sea because we would only bring more land into cultivation?

Mr. TABER. We should not have stored the water to start with. When the Secretary of Agriculture says we do not need the products of the land, why should we go ahead and spend \$2,000,000 additional to bring the land under cultivation?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman realizes there are 12,000,000 people unemployed and we are taxed to support them. Does not the gentleman think they ought to have an opportunity to go on this land and become self-supporting?

Mr. TABER. That is not what is going to happen. You are going to put some other land out of cultivation if you put this land under cultivation. That is the trouble with the whole situation. You are working one hand against the other. You are not going to take any of the unemployed off the rolls.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman realizes the land about which he is talking is land we will use for grazing instead of sending our cattle to Old Mexico. Does not the gentleman believe it would be better to use our own land in New Mexico, in the United States, rather than send the cattle to a foreign country? The Secretary of Agriculture has nothing to do with this. No product of agriculture is raised which will be in competition with other products raised elsewhere.

Mr. TABER. You raise cattle, do you not?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes; we raise cattle, and we want to feed them. This is what we are trying to do by this bill.

Mr. TABER. In the days when the A. A. A. was in full blast the Secretary of Agriculture was reducing the production of cattle. That is exactly what would happen under the bill of the Secretary of Agriculture which is in contemplation now. Why we should consider that kind of a bill and at the same time consider this kind of a project is beyond me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. The cattle which were killed under the A. A. A. program were killed in that district in New Mexico and in my part of Oklahoma for lack of food, lack of grass, lack of anything to keep them alive. It was not a reduction in the beef tonnage at all.

Mr. TABER. That was the program the second year but it was not the first year. The first year the program was to reduce production.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not to reduce beef.

Mr. TABER. Then he got the supply down so low that when we had the drought we had no reserve. Some cattle were killed the second year under the relief act because there was no feed for them. However, the first proposition was to cut down the supply. Of course, he overdid it, just as those fellows always do.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am in the cattle business in western Oklahoma, adjoining New Mexico. I may say to the gentleman that the years of drought we have gone through have cut the carrying capacity of the ranges in some cases so far that only 1 steer or 1 cow can run now where the land formerly would carry 10. A system of raising crops to carry our cattle in conjunction with the range is absolutely necessary for continued operation in that country. It is a question of abandoning the range and abandoning an industry or having auxiliary feed produced. Regardless of how many thousands of acres are brought into production to produce feed for cattle, the permanent injury done to that western sod is going to cut the production of that part of the country way below normal. Regardless of how many thousands of acres you put under irrigation, you cannot bring this land back to normal for a period of at least 20 years. This has been a permanent damage, and it will take all the devices of man to bring that production of beef back to normal under present conditions.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Does not the gentleman think he is carrying the argument a little too far when he refers to the former program of reduction and uses that as an argument against bringing further lands into production in the far West?

Mr. TABER. I would feel that way, if we did not have practically the same kind of a program before Congress right now for consideration, which would work out just the same way.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. My wife called my attention to the fact that even round steak is now selling in this city for nearly 60 cents a pound.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. It is between 50 and 60 cents.

Mr. TABER. This is largely the result of the operations of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I do not care to go into that; but may I call attention to the fact that there is, in my judgment, not enough food, especially meats, for human consumption produced to give our people the nourishment we need as a nation. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] is exactly right concerning the situation on most of the western ranges.

I want to call attention to the fact that conditions have greatly changed in the grazing empire of the far West within the lifetime of one generation. Fifty years ago the livestock ranges of the West were covered with a luxurious growth of nutritious grasses which invited the cattlemen and the sheepmen to come and use them. Overgrazing has resulted, and the Dust Bowl or something like it has come to many parts of the West exactly as to the Middle West. Overgrazing and denuding the plains and the mountains of their cover of vegetation has been accompanied by the same disastrous results as the plowing under of the sod on the Great Plains. Now we are asking the livestockmen of the western ranges to cease their overgrazing and limit their herds. This is a part of our long-range soil-erosion control program and is done for the protection of our great irrigation works.

This Nation is in danger of a shortage of food supply, especially of beef and mutton. We cannot longer expect the populous cities of the East to be so nearly furnished with meat from the far West as formerly. On the other hand, we must not depend on an importation of beef from the Argentine or mutton from Australia to the detriment and despair of our most enterprising and worthy citizens in the Rocky Mountain States, who have devoted their lives to the livestock industry. It is folly to cripple the livestock business in a dozen Western States, in which 95 to 98 percent of the area is not suitable for food production other than for grazing. It is only good sense that we must supplement the natural forage by irrigation and a production of hay and other forage crops. This bill is for only one of many such

projects which common sense dictates the Government should sponsor.

Mr. TABER. Then I wonder why we need this bill that is being put up to us for the control of agriculture.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I want to see more land brought into production of fruit and grains and more grazing furnished us, so we may have the meat that this country needs, and I believe this bill is required from that standpoint.

Mr. TABER. Then, should we follow the other program? Is the gentleman opposed to the bill that the Secretary of Agriculture is going to send up here, or is supposed to send up here?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am in favor of the pending bill, which is the matter under discussion.

Mr. TABER. How does the gentleman feel about the other bill? That is a very important subject, and we ought not to be working both ends against the middle all the time. We ought to have a policy, and that is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. There may be a good many acres of land in certain parts of the country that are worn out and possibly ought to lie fallow or receive treatment, and that is exactly the reason we ought to have supplementary provisions so that we may have a normal food supply in this country, and I believe that this bill is a part of the normal food-supply program.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it, then, that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] was opposed to the philosophy or the policy that destroyed our cattle and killed our pigs, and I presume the gentleman believes in putting more acreage into use right now. I would like to have the gentleman's judgment on that.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I have nothing to say about the former policy of reduction of the food supply, but I do maintain that the health of our people and the proper nourishment of the Nation require such action as this bill calls for.

Mr. MICHENER. We do not want any more tomfoolery about killing pigs and destroying foods, I take it from the gentleman's statement.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Personally, I do not want any more of that. I think there must be other and better ways of aiding farmers to have adequate prices.

Mr. DOWELL. And should we not raise our own products so that we will not have to ship them into the United States from foreign countries?

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. Is there any language in the bill that limits the expenditure that may be made under the measure? May they not spend \$15,000,000, or even \$20,000,000?

Mr. TABER. There is no limitation whatever. They can spend any amount they may want to spend. The bill does not say \$1,000,000 or \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000 but is wide open. I wonder if the chairman would be able to give us some idea of the kind of limitation he would be willing to accept.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Of course, this is merely an authorization. Before they could get the money there would have to be application made to the Appropriations Committee, of which the gentleman from New York is one of the outstanding members.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is true, and the President has asked us to grant no more authorizations unless we provide for raising the money required by the authorization, may I ask the chairman of the Rules Committee if this bill complies with the suggestion of the President and is any provision made for raising the money?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Of course, of the many subjects with which I am not familiar, reclamation is one, and I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MICHENER. I assumed that was true when the gentleman asked his question a moment ago.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In answer to the question just raised, this is one bill that does provide where the money is coming from. When you organize an irrigation district, under the Federal reclamation law, the people mortgage their lands and are under contract to repay the money to the fund. This is not coming out of the general Treasury.

The gentleman has also asked whether or not this would put people to work or reduce unemployment. If the gentleman could live in the territory where such a project is established, he would find that people are already living there and under the present situation where they cannot raise enough winter feed to match the summer range which they have, or if they cannot raise enough feed for the periods of drought, they have to go on the relief rolls, and the gentleman is called upon to pass bills to support them while on relief. A measure like this, where you can establish a sound project for the development of the cattle industry that is already under way, is decidedly in the interest of taking people off of the relief rolls.

Mr. TABER. What is it doing when, as a result of such legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture clamps down somewhere else and takes something else out of production and they go on the relief rolls? This is just running around in a circle.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has already pointed out that it has raised the price of farm products.

Mr. TABER. The operations of the Secretary of Agriculture have raised the price of round steak to 50 cents a pound, but they have destroyed the food supply of the people.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman believe you can raise alfalfa in some of these other districts and ship it down to this district more cheaply?

Mr. TABER. No; you have to raise it near the place of consumption.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. Is it not true that the funds that would be spent would be funds spent in New Mexico that would go into the reclamation fund, but in this way they divert the funds before they get there?

Mr. TABER. I hardly think the New Mexico funds would be sufficient to pay for the projects that are already under way there for quite a considerable time.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. I understood the gentleman said it would not take any money out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. TABER. I did not say that.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. Somebody said it.

Mr. TABER. They said it.

Mr. BEVERLY M. VINCENT. I know it must come out of some treasury.

Mr. TABER. It comes out of the Treasury. Here is where the reclamation fund comes from largely. It comes from oil leases, the sale of public lands, and such things as that. I shall not attempt to enumerate all of the items, but that money comes out of assets that belong to the United States,

and as they are disposed of the money goes into the Treasury, and has been used customarily over a period of twenty-odd years, perhaps 30 years, for the building of these reclamation projects. The fund is also replenished by the repayments of such of those projects as pay out.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I wonder how the gentleman would feel if the Federal Government owned almost half of the land in the State of New York and paid no taxes to the State? That is the situation we have in New Mexico. The mineral rights are reserved, and we have to pay for the grazing rights, and we police all of this at our own expense. The gentleman is trying to tell us that the oil money of New Mexico that goes into this fund as a matter of law should not be used in accordance with law, as provided, to do the very thing it was set up to do.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; I am trying to establish a conservative policy in connection with the reclamation business that would provide that when we needed new land under cultivation, according to the general set-up all over the country, we should spend money for that purpose, and at other times when they did not need such things we should hold back. We should regulate our production by the regulation of the development of the land that goes under cultivation rather than by taking lands out of cultivation that are already there.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does the gentleman not feel that when the Director of the Reclamation Service recommends this project, supported by the Director of the Budget, supported by Members of this House who have studied legislation in committee, that the measure ought to pass?

Mr. TABER. Here is the situation with reference to the Director of the Reclamation Service. The Director of the Reclamation Service, as are all persons in such a position, is a propagandist. He is very much interested in building up his own department.

Those gentlemen just thrive on bigger and better reclamation projects. I do not take the recommendation of those people at full value. There is no coordination between the operation of the Agricultural Department and the Interior Department. One pulls one way and the other pulls the other way. The result of it is that we are spending money at both ends when we might be better conserving it.

I asked a question of the chairman of the committee a little while ago and I have not had an answer as yet. I would like to know what kind of limit the chairman of the committee would be willing to accept as to the cost of this project.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The limit is already placed on the cost. It is limited by the water stored in the reservoir. There cannot be any more money spent than water used.

Mr. TABER. There is no dollar limitation as to cost in this whole bill. How about the author of the bill? Would he be willing to accept an amendment limiting the cost?

Mr. DEMPSEY. The Reclamation Service will determine the cost. The cost runs not to exceed a certain amount per acre. If the cost exceeds that the Reclamation Service will not construct the district.

Mr. TABER. What is that limit?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not know what limit they would put on it; but unless the cost per acre is such that these farmers who own this land can pay it back in the prescribed time the Director of Reclamation will not construct the district. It must be left in his hands.

Mr. TABER. Do not the hearings on this bill show the probable cost of the project?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would say that it would cost between \$80 and \$90 an acre, and there would be approximately 30,000 acres.

Mr. TABER. That would be somewhere around \$2,000,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Two and a half million dollars to \$2,700,000.

Mr. TABER. Is there any statement from the Bureau of Reclamation to that effect?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have no statement from the Bureau for the reason that its figures have not been entirely compiled with reference to the number of acres involved.

Mr. TABER. What would the gentleman say is the value of this particular land as it stands today?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I could not say as to that. When we have a year with plenty of rain and the grazing is good, the cost is up, but when we have a year like last year, when we sent 40,000 head of cattle to Old Mexico, you could have bought the land very reasonably.

But that is not the point at issue here. It is this: We have these people living in this Dust Bowl. We have the water there. We have their lands which they are willing to mortgage to the full extent. We have the Reclamation Service willing to do this job. Do you want to drive these people out of the business they have been in all their lives and put them some place else on relief, or do you want to give the man opportunity to earn a livelihood independently?

Mr. TABER. The trouble with that argument is that if these people had been there all their lives and made a living they did not have a reclamation project to support them. Why, with that picture, do they need it now? That is the result of the gentleman's argument, as it looks to me.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Many lands in the States of Kansas and Colorado that were put in cultivation during the war when we needed more agriculture is in part responsible for some of the destruction of the lands of New Mexico by reason of these dust storms. We are not responsible for that. We are not responsible because they tried to serve the Federal Government by raising the things they wanted when they wanted them. We say to you now we are not asking for a dollar out of the Federal Treasury. All we are asking is to loan some of our money back to us, and we will repay it. That is the situation in connection with the matter. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I should take any more time of the House on this matter. It is perfectly apparent that this is another reclamation project at just the time when we ought not to have it. I hope the House will use its judgment on this matter and will not go into another project of this kind at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a Federal reclamation project for the irrigation of the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico under the Federal reclamation laws: *Provided,* That construction work is not to be initiated on said irrigation project until (a) the project shall have been found to be feasible under subsection B of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and (b) a contract shall have been executed with an irrigation or conservation district embracing the land to be irrigated under said project, which contract shall obligate the contracting district to repay the cost of construction of said project in 40 equal annual installments, without interest; (c) contracts shall have been made with each owner of more than 160 irrigable acres under said project, by which he, his successors, and assigns shall be obligated to sell all of his land in excess of 160 irrigable acres at or below prices fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and within the time to be fixed by said Secretary, no water to be furnished to the land of any such large landowner refusing or failing to execute such contract; and (d) contracts shall have been made with all owners of lands to be irrigated under the project by which they will agree that if their land is sold at prices above the appraised value thereof, approved by said Secretary, one-half of such excess shall be paid to the United States to be applied in the inverse order of the due dates upon the construction charge installments coming due thereafter from the owners of said land.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] a few questions. I happened to listen with a great deal of interest to the colloquy between the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I was very much interested in the very able and effective manner in which the gentleman from New Mexico conveyed to the House the

purposes of this bill. I would like to ask one or two questions to obtain additional information. How large is this area?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It will comprise about thirty or thirty-five thousand acres.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many people will it benefit?

Mr. DEMPSEY. About a thousand families.

Mr. McCORMACK. And this is in an area affected by the drought?

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is affected by the drought. It is in the Dust Bowl. It is a cattle-grazing country.

Mr. McCORMACK. And this will enable the people who have owned their land to continue living there?

Mr. DEMPSEY. To retain their lands, feed their stock without shipping it to foreign countries to feed.

Mr. McCORMACK. And they are people who have lived for a long period of time, some families probably for some generations?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Many of them have lived there for many years.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the water is available?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. At no expense to the Government?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Not any. [Applause.]

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the same do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PETTENGILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7680, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 61 and noes 8.

So the bill was passed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2086, now on the Speaker's table, be substituted for the House bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to construct a Federal reclamation project for the irrigation of the lands of the Arch Hurley conservancy district in New Mexico under the Federal reclamation laws: *Provided,* That construction work is not to be initiated on said irrigation project until (a) the project shall have been found to be feasible under subsection B of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 702), and (b) a contract shall have been executed with an irrigation or conservation district embracing the land to be irrigated under said project, which contract shall obligate the contracting district to repay the cost of construction of said project in 40 equal annual installments, without interest; (c) contracts shall have been made with each owner of more than 160 irrigable acres under said project, by which he, his successors, and assigns shall be obligated to sell all of his land in excess of 160 irrigable acres at or below prices fixed by the Secretary of the Interior and within the time to be fixed by said Secretary, no water to be furnished to the land of any such large landowner refusing or failing to execute such contract; and (d) contracts shall have been made with all owners of lands to be irrigated under the project by which they will agree that if their land is sold at prices above the appraised value thereof, approved by said Secretary, one-half of such excess shall be paid to the United States to be applied in the inverse order of the due dates upon the construction charge installments coming due thereafter from the owners of said land.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the procedure whereby the bill H. R. 7680 was passed will be vacated and that bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

COMPACT OR AGREEMENT FOR DIVISION OF WATERS OF YELLOWSTONE RIVER

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I call up the bill (S. 534) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement, not later than June 1, 1939, providing for an equitable division and apportionment between the States of the water supply of the Yellowstone River and of the streams tributary thereto, upon condition that one suitable person, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: *Provided,* That such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon either of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States: *Provided further,* That nothing in this act shall apply to any waters within the Yellowstone National Park or shall establish any right or interest in or to any lands within the boundaries thereof.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. The bill is on the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 534) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River, with Mr. PETTENGILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Mr. Chairman, this bill has already passed the Senate. It grants the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River. This river, as perhaps you all know, rises in the northwestern part of the State of Wyoming, in the Yellowstone National Park. It flows in a northerly direction into the State of Montana, and from there in a northeasterly direction across the State of Montana into the Missouri River somewhere near the Dakota line. What is known as the Tongue River rises in the State of Wyoming and flows north into Montana and from there into the Yellowstone River. Likewise what is known as Clarks Fork River and Big Horn River rise in the State of Wyoming and flow north into the Yellowstone River.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not want to interrupt the splendid speech of the gentleman from Montana, who has done such fine work for his State, but may I inquire

If this is just a simple compact between two States to divide the waters of the Yellowstone River?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. It is simply an authorization given by Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to enter into a compact which will have to be ratified by the legislatures of both States and then be approved by Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is just a simple matter that relates only to the two States mentioned?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Exactly; and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. GREEVER. As a matter of fact, it merely authorizes the States to enter into this compact, does it not?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. GREEVER. It merely authorizes them to negotiate the compact. Of course, after the compact is made it has to be referred to the Federal Congress for approval.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. GREEVER. Has the gentleman any objection to an amendment, on page 2, in line 7, after the word "within", to insert "or tributary to"?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Making that provision read:

That nothing in this act shall apply to any waters within or tributary to the Yellowstone National Park or shall establish any right or interest in or to any lands within the boundaries thereof.

Mr. GREEVER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I have no objection. As a matter of fact, I thank the gentleman for the proposed amendment, for none of us want to interfere in any way with any of the waters or any of the streams in the park or Yellowstone Lake therein. The only necessity for the passage of this bill is because of a conflict of interest between the States of Montana and Wyoming concerning the use of waters of the Tongue River, the Big Horn River, and the Clarks Fork River.

Mr. GREEVER. As a matter of fact, if the gentleman will permit an interruption, the controversy involves the Tongue River, Big Horn River, and tributaries of the Big Horn and Tongue and one or two other small streams.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. There are a good many precedents for this kind of authorization for the making of compacts by States in the matter of boundaries, rivers, harbors, and such things?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Oh, yes. As a matter of fact, it is the only way such matters can be settled. They cannot be settled in court because the expense is too great.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BACON. Has this bill the approval of the National Park Service?

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. GREEVER. Answering the gentleman from New York, I may state that the bill has a favorable report of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BACON. That answers my question.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Such approval is included in the report.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. As a lawyer and a man of extensive observation concerning our West, does not the gentleman regard it as a good policy that, not only in this case but in a great many other cases, agreements or compacts be made between States? We understand, of course, that such agreement cannot be made without the consent of Congress, treaties between two, three, or more States, but is it not necessary, in the gentleman's judgment, that many such interstate agreements be entered into before the control of rivers can be properly carried out?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Exactly. I think it is a good policy to pursue, because it saves a lot of feeling and a lot of expense to dispose of such matters in this fashion.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Would not such a course also answer the objection we hear frequently that the Federal Government is going too far in its control of these streams in which the States themselves have a vital interest but in which local interest seems to be neglected?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I think the gentleman's observation is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. This policy of interstate compacts would further preserve to the States those rights which they feel are inherently theirs concerning such interstate streams?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. GREEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. GREEVER. There is nothing in this bill which is in any way binding on any of the States with respect to the water, with the exception of the protection of the waters of the Yellowstone.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like for the gentleman to point out for the RECORD the provision of the Constitution or some Federal statute which gives Congress jurisdiction with respect to compacts between States. It seems to me that might be pointed out at this time.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HEALEY. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi there is provision in the Constitution.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I asked to have it placed in the RECORD. It occurred to me that provision should be put in the RECORD.

Mr. HEALEY. The States, as a matter of fact, cannot enter into a compact without conforming to that particular provision.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am agreeable to that view, but with reference to the former question I thought it would be well for the RECORD to show that.

Mr. HEALEY. I will be glad to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I do not at this moment recall the particular section of the Constitution which restricts States from entering into contracts such as this without congressional authorization. However, I will include the citation in my remarks:

Revision of remarks, article I, section 10, paragraph 3.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state why there is a limitation of time in this bill? The date of June 1, 1939, is set forth. Is that not rather a short time for your own benefit?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts this matter has been under discussion for some time by the officials of both the States of Wyoming and Montana, for the reason the waters of the Tongue River, particularly, have been in conflict between the residents of the two States. Both States recognize the right of acquiring water by appropriation. But suppose somebody appropriates water on the Wyoming side and, on the other hand, somebody appropriates water from the same stream on the Montana side and a shortage of water occurs. There is then a conflict as to whose rights are prior in time, which priority is recognized by the law so far as the appropriation of water is concerned. This being the case, in order to determine the respective rights, it is required, if a compact is not entered into, that the litigants go into court. All of the people who used water out of some stream on the

Wyoming and Montana side would be parties to the action, and it would result in endless litigation and would be very expensive for all people concerned.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The fact is, this bill does not commit the Congress to any compact or any agreement which may be made?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Absolutely not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is borne out by the proviso of the bill, which reads as follows:

Provided, That such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon either of the parties hereto unless and until same shall be approved by the legislatures of each State, as well as by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. That is correct.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. So that, as a matter of fact, this is merely an authorization. It does not commit the Congress to any compact which may be entered into by the States?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. That is correct, and I want to thank the gentleman for the contribution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], I call attention to paragraph 2, section 10, of the Constitution, wherein it is stated:

No State shall without the consent of Congress . . . enter into any agreement or compact with another State.

That is the constitutional power for compacts between States?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Yes. The States would not have the right to make the compact unless the Congress gave them the authority.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Then, as the gentleman from Massachusetts points out, the authority is article I, section 10 of the Constitution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. For a number of years the States of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas have had a similar authorization from the Congress, but these States have not been able to work out a division of the waters of the Rio Grande. The Congress has twice passed a bill extending the time within which these States may enter into a compact identical with that contained in the gentleman's bill which involves the States of Montana and Wyoming. I think Congress has authorized such compacts in a number of other cases.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. How much is this going to cost?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Here is one bill, I may say to the Members of the House, and I include the Members of the Appropriations Committee, that will not cost the United States 1 cent. [Applause.]

Mr. HOUSTON. Were there any arguments against this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. No arguments; no.

Mr. HOUSTON. Then what are we waiting for? Let us vote.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman explain to the committee what the object of this bill is?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. The object of the bill is, as I tried to explain before, and I will ask the gentleman to pay attention to this explanation. The object of the bill is to permit the States of Wyoming and Montana to settle their respective rights in the waters of the tributaries of the

Yellowstone River, which flows across the State of Montana principally, in order to avoid endless litigation between private parties living in both States who have conflicting interests in the waters of those tributaries of the Yellowstone River.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman stated that the Yellowstone flows into the Missouri at or near the Dakota line. The gentleman means the North Dakota line?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman have in mind what effect the compact would have on the flow of the Missouri River and the right of residents along the Missouri River in North Dakota and South Dakota?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. It would not have any effect. The only waters affected by this bill would be the waters of the Clarks Fork River, that rises in Wyoming and flows through Carbon County and on through Montana, and also the Big Horn River and what is known as the Tongue River. They are three small tributaries of the Yellowstone. Those are the only waters about which there is any conflict.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does this have any bearing upon the waters of the Fort Peck Reservoir?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. None at all.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In view of the fact that the Big Thompson project is to come up tomorrow, I believe, this is further evidence that in that section of the country the capture of water from the streams is life itself. Is not that about the situation?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Of course, in our territory land without water is not worth anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That truth is somewhat difficult for the easterner to comprehend.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I say this, and I say it so my friend the gentleman from New York may hear it, that we out West have very, very fine productive soil, probably the finest that was ever made. At the same time, it is absolutely worthless in that arid country unless we have water to irrigate these lands. We have the water to irrigate these lands; and if we can secure the money to impound this water so that the same may be available for use on the lands and complete our irrigation system, as we are now trying to do, we will not be coming here on bended knees asking for appropriations from Congress to take care of our people, many of whom are now on relief.

This program will serve another useful national purpose, namely, the waters that are now escaping through our major streams, being of benefit to no one, are found causing floods in the lower central parts of the United States to the tremendous damage of the occupants of the lowlands along the streams in the latter territories.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. In answer to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] I think some of us easterners can understand that it is probably necessary to have water on this land, but what we cannot understand is why you should keep bringing in new land and putting it under water in order to raise more crops when you are paying farmers not to raise crops on land on which they can produce at the present time. We cannot understand such a system, and this is why some of us oppose increasing the number of these irrigation and reclamation projects.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from New York I am confident that if the men who oppose reclamation could see this territory and realize the garden spots which are created by the use of water, and realize the desert character of this territory before water is put on the land, they would be most active in favor of reclamation.

May I say further, in answer to the gentleman's statement about entering into competition with the Eastern States and violating the policy of the Department of Agriculture

with reference to curtailing production, that, as the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico pointed out, we do not and could not raise much more than enough to take care of our livestock and take care of our people of the West if we irrigated all the available irrigable lands.

Mr. SNELL. Then, if you cannot raise such products, why should we not use the lands in the Middle West for raising them, rather than pay farmers for not using land at the present time? This is what I cannot understand.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. If the gentleman is talking to me personally, I may say I have never believed in the curtailment of production. I believe in the economy of plenty. It is my opinion that we have never had a surplus of consumable products and goods beyond human needs. We had such surpluses beyond market demands. Of course, we had a shortage of money, therefore no buying power, and many people went without the necessities of life, hence the surpluses. I also am a firm believer in the American farmer being permitted to furnish to the American consumers all the products he can raise of which the consumers are in need and can use; in other words, I believe in the protection of the American producer against the importation of farm and livestock products from foreign countries in competition with the American farmer and livestock grower.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I think the people of the country would get along better if we had plenty, instead of curtailing production. However, I may say that in all of these reclamation territories we do not raise much more than enough to take care of our livestock, our sheep, and cattle, because, after all, we are a sheep and cattle country.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, we get a great many products here in the East which come from these reclamation areas in the western country and are in competition with our eastern products.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Yes; and they are about the best products you eat, too.

Mr. SNELL. I am not saying anything against them, but the gentleman states they do not raise enough out there to do more than support themselves.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Very little. We may raise some, but we import more from your part of the country than we export to you.

Mr. SNELL. That may be. It is the policy, not the individual project, that I am opposing.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Is it not a fact that the crops raised on the irrigated lands in the West are not the crops which produce the burdensome surpluses that embarrass the East?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. The gentleman is correct. They are simply forage crops or crops principally for livestock. We western meat growers supply the Chicago market, and they in turn supply your eastern markets.

Mr. SNELL. What about the potato and apple crops which come from the irrigated sections in the West?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. We do not export many potatoes out there.

Mr. SNELL. They advertise Idaho potatoes all over the country.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Yes; Idaho is a good potato-producing country.

Mr. SNELL. Western apples also come in competition with eastern apples, so do not say your western products do not come in competition with our eastern products.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. To a certain extent; but I mean that we buy from you more than we sell to you.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I notice the bill states—

That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement.

These authorities, as a rule, are not worded in this way. You provide for a commission or some agency of the State to enter into the compact. This seems to be rather loosely drawn.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I may say to the gentleman that the respective States set up their own mechanics to bring this compact or agreement into existence. Then the agreement or compact must be passed upon by the legislatures of the respective States and then come back here to Congress for approval.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. I think my friend knows a great deal about these compacts and realizes that, as a matter of fact, the States could actually negotiate a compact or agreement without the consent of Congress in advance, and come in later and ask for the approval by the Congress of the compact they have entered into; but all you are doing by this measure is to grant the authorization and Congress is merely giving its stamp of approval to this procedure.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not like to let this form go through without calling attention to it and objecting to its becoming a precedent for the future. I may say the Judiciary Committee had before it this morning one of these compacts. We have quite a number of them, and I believe these matters should be very carefully drawn. You provide here further that one suitable person who shall be appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in such negotiations. Unless you provide some machinery or unless you provide for a commission, it may be possible for one State to set up its legislature to do the acting and another State to act through a commission and another State to act through a representative or a State agency like the secretary of state's office, and then provide that the Federal Government have one man cooperating with all these people. I am not going to oppose this, but I do say before your committee brings in another authorization for compacts they should give a little consideration to the precedents and the matters that have been disposed of in the past, so there will be some intelligent action. I do not know how the man named by the President is going to act. He has not anybody with which to cooperate. He is going to cooperate with the States if and when the States determine what they are going to do and how they are going to do it.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. I yielded to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MICHENER. And I have made a pretty good speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member opposed to the bill who desires time? If not, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact, or agreement, not later than June 1, 1939, providing for an equitable division and apportionment between the States of the water supply of the Yellowstone River and of the streams tributary thereto, upon condition that one suitable person, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of proceedings and of any compact or agreement entered into: Provided, That such compact or agreement shall not be binding or obligatory upon either of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been approved by the legislatures of each of said States and by the Congress of the United States: Provided further, That nothing in this act shall apply to any waters within the Yellowstone National Park or shall establish any right or interest in or to any lands within the boundaries thereof.

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREEVER: On page 2, line 7, after the word "within", insert "or tributary to."

Mr. GREEVER. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to more fully protect the waters of the Yellowstone Park and except them in any way from this compact;

also by excepting any streams which are tributary to those streams and waters and which, by any division of any kind, might in some way affect the waters within the Yellowstone.

Mr. MICHENER. Suppose those tributary streams had their headwaters outside of the States authorized to enter into the compact?

Mr. GREEVER. They could not be affected by a compact of this nature, and, in fact, do not exist insofar as this amendment is concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. What I am getting at is if we authorize two States, naming them, to enter into a compact, and it develops that a third or a fourth State is affected by the water that eventually gets into the streams of the two States mentioned, would there be authority under the act for the other States, having property rights in this water, to enter into a compact? We had the same thing up exactly with respect to Boulder Dam. I have forgotten the details, but Colorado, Nevada, and Arizona were affected, and two or three other States where the waters eventually got into States affected by the compact, and, of course, our law in the East as to appropriation of water is entirely different from the law in the West, and there was a lot of trouble with respect to the ratification of those compacts.

Mr. GREEVER. Obviously the States of Montana and Wyoming could not enter into a compact which would affect the waters of any other State or any rights acquired under the laws of any other State in and to those waters, but I am speaking only of streams that are tributary to the streams or bodies of water within the Yellowstone Park; in other words, no one wants to diminish the amount of water that flows into the Yellowstone or to diminish those streams in any way, and this amendment is for their further protection. The Yellowstone Park is one of the finest recreational centers in the world, and no citizen of Wyoming and, I hope, of Montana would ever wish to do the slightest act to detract from the beauty of this great primitive area.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PETTENGILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 534, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MEEKS, for 1 week, on account of important business.

To Mr. BOEHNE, for 10 days, on account of business.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. There seems to be only about 50 Members present.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1762. An act to add certain lands to the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon;

S. 1806. An act to extend the boundaries of the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona;

S. 1972. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell, loan, or give samples of supplies and equipment to prospective manufacturers;

S. 2295. An act to amend the act approved June 7, 1935 (Public, No. 116, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 332), to provide for an additional number of cadets at the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 2587. An act providing for the sale of the two dormitory properties belonging to the Chickasaw Nation or Tribe of Indians, in the vicinity of the Murray State School of Agriculture at Tishomingo, Okla.;

S. 2661. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Maine and New Hampshire for the creation of the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority; and

S. 2662. An act authorizing the Maine-New Hampshire Interstate Bridge Authority to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Piscataqua River at or near Portsmouth, State of New Hampshire.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 22, 1937, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Research Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, July 22, 1937. Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 1536, H. R. 5531, H. R. 7001, and H. R. 7643, research bills.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Subcommittee on Aeronautics of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives will hold an open meeting on Friday, July 23, 1937, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of investigating the establishment of a District airport in the vicinity of naval radio receiving station at Cheltenham, Md., Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, July 28, 1937, at 10 a. m., eastern standard time, on H. R. 7486, known as the bill to increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard.

Persons desiring to testify are requested to notify the clerk of the committee. Parties who do not intend to testify but who wish to submit a statement for the record are requested to file such statement with the clerk of the committee not later than the date of the hearing.

For the information of those persons who intend to testify, it is the desire of the committee that amendments to be proposed during the hearing be submitted in writing to the clerk of the committee prior to the date of the hearing.

It is very important that notice of intention to testify—even though doubtful of fulfillment—be communicated to the clerk of the committee at least 1 day in advance of the hearing. Otherwise unnecessary confusion and delay might arise, resulting in a reduction of the time available for presentation of testimony by witnesses.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

732. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1938, amounting to \$340,600, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for

that Department (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

733. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed amendment to H. R. 6868, entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

734. A letter from the Clerk, House of Representatives, transmitting the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives for the Seventy-fifth Congress of the United States for the First Congressional District of the State of New Hampshire, *Alphonse Roy v. Arthur B. Jenks*, notice of which has been filed in the office of the Clerk of the House; and also transmit herewith original testimony, papers, and documents relating thereto (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Elections No. 3 and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7902. A bill to regulate proceedings in adoption in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6351. A bill to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Project near Dumfries, Va., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6652. A bill to provide for the administration and maintenance of the Natchez Trace Parkway, in the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee, by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7264. A bill to revise the boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, to abolish the Grand Canyon National Monument, to restore certain lands to the public domain, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7825. A bill to authorize the use of certain facilities of national parks and national monuments for elementary-school purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7826. A bill to make available for national-park purposes certain lands within the boundaries of the proposed Isle Royale National Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7931. A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to cancer; to establish the National Cancer Institute; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAMILTON: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7560. A bill to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. O'CONNOR of Montana: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 190. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court

of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Waterton Oil, Land & Power Co., of Butte, Mont., against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 7948) providing for the promotion of employees in the Customs Field Service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 7949) to exempt State liquor-dispensing systems from the requirement of keeping certain records and rendering transcripts and summaries of entries with respect to distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMISANO: A bill (H. R. 7950) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 7951) to amend section 6, title 28, United States Code as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KVALE: A bill (H. R. 7952) to establish the Pipestone National Monument in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FERGUSON: A bill (H. R. 7953) to provide for studies and plans for the development of reclamation projects on the Cimarron River in Cimarron County, Okla.; the Washita River in Oklahoma; and the North Canadian River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7954) to provide for studies and plans for the development of a reclamation project on the Cimarron River in Cimarron County, Okla.; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 7955) granting pensions to veterans of the World War, their widows, and dependents; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 7956) to reimburse officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army and their families and dependents, or their legal representatives, for losses sustained as a result of a hurricane which occurred in Texas on August 16, 17, and 18, 1915; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'TOOLE: A bill (H. R. 7957) to provide for the issuance and licensing of food handlers for the protection of public health and to provide penalties for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHELCHER: A bill (H. R. 7958) regulating the selection of materials to be used in buildings erected on Government property; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 7959) providing for Federal service medals of honor to Government employees for distinguished service; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DIES: Resolution (H. Res. 282) providing for a special committee to investigate un-American propaganda; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KRAMER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 450) for the relief of the Forty-eighth District Agricultural Association of California; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 7960) for the relief of Wilma Artopoulos; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KELLY of New York: A bill (H. R. 7961) granting a pension to Jane Flynn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'TOOLE: A bill (H. R. 7962) for the relief of Domenico Mazzella; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 7963) for the relief of George H. Lowe, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 7964) for the relief of the estate of T. M. White; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7965) for the relief of Dr. Thomas M. Barnett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEAVY: A bill (H. R. 7966) for the relief of Capt. James L. Alverson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2985. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the New York County Lawyers Association, New York City, urging adoption of House bill 4472, introduced by Congressman VOORHIS, making eligible for citizenship persons who had entered this country between June 3, 1921, and July 1, 1924, and who have been residing here continuously since that time; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2986. Also, petition of the State Relief Agency, St. Paul, Minn., endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 85, providing an appropriation of \$20,000 to investigate the social and economic needs of laborers migrating across State lines; to the Committee on Labor.

2987. Also, petition of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, regarding air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2988. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of citizens of California, opposing the enactment of new legislation which would nullify the California community property law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2989. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, relative to interest on public-demand deposits, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2990. By Mr. LEAVY: Petition of the Ellisforde Grange, No. 1010, urging the Government to impose an embargo on arms and ammunition against the Governments of Italy and Germany for their participation in the Spanish rebellion and their unlawful acts of aggression in that conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2991. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Concurrent resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan, endorsing continuance of the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2992. Also, petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 295, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 2691; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2993. Also, House Concurrent Resolution No. 43, of the State of Michigan, providing for granting of consent to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority of Michigan to construct a bridge across the Straits of Mackinac; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2994. Also, petition of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, urging the improvement of conditions surrounding employment of substitute post-office clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2995. Also, petition of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, opposing salary reductions or furloughs in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2996. Also, petition of the Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 295, Detroit, Mich., endorsing the enactment of legislation establishing a system of longevity pay for post-office clerks and other post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2997. Also, petition of the Detroit Federation of Post Office Clerks, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 4647; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2998. Also, petition of the Federation of Post Office Clerks, Local 295, Detroit, Mich., endorsing House bill 3415; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2999. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing Senate Joint Resolution 142; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3000. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing House bill 6814; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3001. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing Senate bill 1306; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3002. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing House bill 5852; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3003. Also, petition of the Michigan State Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing Senate bill 615; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 22, 1937

The Reverend Richard A. Cartmell, D. D., assistant rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, the Father of us all, whose love passeth human understanding, whose presence is nearer than the breath of life: Grant to us, we beseech Thee, the nourishment of Thy grace that daily we may grow unto the image of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Even as He, may we, also, seek above all else Thy honor and glory; Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace. Bestow upon us such a measure of His spirit that we may make no compromise with wrong, yet see a vision of Thee in every living soul, so that when we gain our victory, O Lord, it may be Christ's victory of justice and truth, wrought not on the anvil of hate but in the fire of love. And in the end grant that every one of us may come to love Thee with the fullness of our being and our neighbor as ourself. Through the same, Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous request, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 20, 1937, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 13, 1937:

S. 557. An act authorizing the naturalization of James Lincoln Hartley, and for other purposes;

S. 727. An act validating homestead entry billings 029004 of Lillian J. Glinn;

S. 767. An act for the relief of the Charles T. Miller Hospital at St. Paul, Minn.; Dr. Edgar T. Herrmann; Ruth Kehoe, nurse; and Catherine Foley, nurse;

S. 1474. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Navy of Clyde J. Nesser, a lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy, retired; and

S. 2497. An act authorizing John Monroe Johnson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, to accept the decoration tendered him by the Belgian Government.

On July 14, 1937:

S. 171. An act for the relief of George E. Shockley.

On July 15, 1937:

S. 114. An act for the relief of Mildred Moore.

On July 16, 1937:

S. 828. An act for the relief of Ellen Taylor;

S. 885. An act for the relief of H. G. Harmon;

S. 1048. An act for the relief of Alexander E. Kovner;

S. 1188. An act for the relief of J. E. Sammons; and

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Halle D. McCullough.

On July 17, 1937:

S. 630. An act for the relief of the Sheehy Drilling Co.;

S. 1849. An act for the relief of the Goldenberg Furniture Co.; and

S. 2266. An act for the relief of John A. Ensor.

On July 19, 1937:

S. 1257. An act for the relief of James H. Smith.